

**A MEETING OF THE  
BOROUGH OF TELFORD & WREKIN**

**Will be held at Shropshire College Hotel Ltd  
(The Telford Whitehouse) (Telford Suite)  
Watling Street, Wellington, Telford TF1 2NJ  
Please use the Conference Entrance  
on THURSDAY 9<sup>th</sup> JULY, 2015 at 6.30 p.m.**

**All Members are summoned to attend for the transaction  
of the under mentioned business**

**Assistant Director: Law, Democracy & Public Protection**

---

**A G E N D A**

**1. MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL**

To confirm the minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Council and the Special Meeting of the Council held on 21 May 2015

**Appendix A  
White  
Pages 1-14**

**2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members are reminded that they must not participate in the discussion or voting on any matter in which they have a disclosable pecuniary interest and should leave the room prior to commencement of that item

**4. LEADER'S REPORT & ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Leader of the Council may give an oral report on matters of significance to the Borough, comment upon the Cabinet decisions or make any announcements.

**5. MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

To note the Mayoral Engagements undertaken since the Annual Council meeting of the held on 21st May, 2015.

**Appendix B  
White  
Pages 15-16**

**6. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

To receive any questions from the public which have been submitted under Council Procedure Rules 7.11 and 7.12. The session will last no more than 15 minutes with a maximum of 2 minutes allowed for each question and answer. Questions can be asked of The Leader and Cabinet Members.

With the biggest changes to Bus services in Telford/ Wrekin in the last 10 years, I'm concerned about the lack of consultation by Arriva & the impact these changes will have on the most vulnerable. I'm pleased to see the council has raised these concerns. Could the Cabinet Member update me?

John Thompson  
Chair Telford Wrekin Bus User Group  
25 Broadway Avenue  
Trench

**7. CABINET DECISIONS MADE SINCE THE LAST MEETING OF THE COUNCIL**

To receive the report on the Cabinet decisions made since publication of the last Council meeting agenda. Cabinet Members may speak on these decisions and Members may ask questions of the relevant Cabinet Member for the purposes of clarification only. Members are asked to note the additional delegations to officers granted at those meetings.

**Appendix C  
White  
Pages 17-24**

## 8. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CABINET

Appendix D  
Yellow  
Pages 25-62

Cabinet 25 June 2015

2014/15 Out-turn and Initial Monitoring for 2015/16

Recommended that –

- (i) the Revenue out-turn position and related virements for 2014/15, shown in Appendix 3 of the report (and subject to audit by the Council's external auditors), and the transfers to reserves detailed in paragraph 5.3 of the report be approved;
- (ii) the Capital out-turn position and related supplementary estimates, virements and re-phasing, shown in Appendix 4 of the report, be approved;
- (iii) that performance against income targets be noted;
- (iv) that the key issues identified for 2015/16 be noted, and the new capital allocation detailed in paragraph 8.2 be approved.

## 9. IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW LEGISLATION AND CHANGES TO CONSTITUTION – STATUTORY OFFICERS

Appendix E  
White  
Pages 63-72

To consider the report of the People Services Manager, Legal Services Manager and Audit Manager which proposes, following recent changes to legislation, changes to the disciplinary process for Head of Paid Service, Chief Financial Officer and Monitoring Officer. The report seeks approval for changes to the constitution and agreement of local arrangements for the Council in respect of new legislative requirements.

The report also seeks approval for changes to the Terms of Reference of Audit Committee resulting from the 30 June meeting

Recommended that –

- (i) That the Council's Constitution be amended to incorporate the new legislative requirements and that Council consider approving the proposed arrangement as detailed in Appendix 1 for the disciplining and dismissal of senior staff as set out in the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2015 (SI 2015/881), ("the Regulations")
- (ii) That the current Independent Persons engaged by the Council for member conduct issues be invited to fulfil the role of Independent Persons under the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2015 (SI 2015/881), ("the Regulations").

(iii) The Council confirm agreement for the arrangements in Appendix 1 to contain a panel made up of Independent Persons and that accordingly the requirement for political balance does not apply in accordance with the provisions in section 17 of the Local Government Act 1972.

(iv) That further reports be submitted to Council as national contractual and legislative issues are determined.

(v) That the Constitutional Changes recommended by Audit Committee at its meeting of 30 June 2015 be approved.

## 10. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM BOARDS & COMMITTEES

Appendix F  
Green  
Pages 73-80

### Audit Committee

At its meeting held on 30 June 2015, the Audit Committee made the following recommendations to Council.

#### Anti-Fraud and Corruption Policy

**Recommended – that the updated Policy be adopted.**

## 11. MINUTES OF BOARDS AND COMMITTEES

To note the following resolved Minutes (Salmon paper):  
Boundary Review Committee – 29 January 2015

Salmon  
Paper  
Appendix G  
Pages 81-84

Co-Operative and Communities Scrutiny Committee – 24 March 2015

Appendix H  
Pages 85-90

Health and Wellbeing Board – 21 January 2015 and 11 March 2015

Appendix I1-  
I2  
Pages 91-110

Licensing Committee – 24 March 2015

Appendix J  
Pages 111-114

Planning Committee – 25 February 2015, 18 March 2015, 8 April 2015 and 3 June 2015

Appendix  
K1-K4  
Pages 115-156

## 12. QUESTIONS

To answer questions received under Council Procedure Rule 7.

**N.B. *In accordance with the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 7.4 there will be a maximum of 30 minutes allowed for questions and answers. Any question not answered within the 30 minute time limit will receive a written reply within 5 working days.***

## 13. NOTICES OF MOTION

(i) Councillor A J Eade will move, in accordance with Council procedure rule 11, the following motion:

This Council notes with concern the proposed changes to bus routes announced by Arriva and condemns their lack of proper consultation and consideration of community needs in Telford and Wrekin. This council therefore resolves to press Arriva for an extension to the current 19<sup>th</sup> of July deadline in order for the Company to gather views, allow proper consideration and reflection on the impact which their current actions will inflict on our community.

This Council further resolves to act on behalf of the Community and challenge Arriva's decision if proper consultation and consideration does not take place

The motion will be seconded by Councillor S Bentley

(ii) Councillor E Carter will move, in accordance with Council procedure rule 11, the following motion:

This council notes with regret the previous Administration's decision to close the well-used recycling centre at Newport, while at the same time granting planning permission for over a thousand new houses in the town. Consequently, this Council requests that the Administration works with the community to provide a new facility in this part of the Borough.

The motion will be seconded by Councillor T Nelson

(iii) Councillor A McClements will move, in accordance with Council procedure rule 11, the following motion:

“With a number of MPs now speaking out against their own Government's ill thought-out Bedroom Tax, we call on our two MPs for both The Wrekin and Telford to support this Council's opposition to the Bedroom Tax and call on the Government to scrap this flawed policy with immediate effect, which is having a detrimental and devastating effect on the lives of so many vulnerable people in our Borough who are

renting from a registered housing association or other registered social landlords.”

The motion will be seconded by Councillor S Reynolds

**KEY**

Yellow paper

White Paper

Green Paper

Salmon Paper

Recommendations from Cabinet to Full Council

Reports submitted direct to Full Council

Recommendations from Committees, Boards and

Commissions requiring approval by Full Council

Resolved minutes for noting only

## **FILMING, RECORDING & PHOTOGRAPHY**

The Council supports the principle of transparency and encourages filming, recording and taking photographs at its meetings that are open to the public. It also welcomes the use of social networking websites (such as Twitter and Facebook) and micro-blogging to communicate with people about what is happening, as it happens.

There is no requirement to notify the Council in advance, but it should be noted that the Chairman of the meeting will have absolute discretion to terminate or suspend any of these activities if, in their opinion, continuing to do so would prejudice proceedings at the meeting. Full details of the Council's protocol on audio/visual recording and photography at meetings can be accessed via the following link:

[http://www.telford.gov.uk/info/20243/council\\_meetings/365/filming\\_photography\\_recording\\_and\\_use\\_of\\_social\\_networking\\_at\\_meetings](http://www.telford.gov.uk/info/20243/council_meetings/365/filming_photography_recording_and_use_of_social_networking_at_meetings)

## **PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

At each Ordinary meeting of the Council a period of **15 minutes** will be allocated for public questions. Questions can be asked of The Leader and Cabinet Members. Details of the protocol for public questions can be accessed via the following link:

[http://www.telford.gov.uk/info/20243/council\\_meetings/364/public\\_questions\\_at\\_council\\_meetings](http://www.telford.gov.uk/info/20243/council_meetings/364/public_questions_at_council_meetings)

## **BOROUGH OF TELFORD & WREKIN**

### **Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Borough of Telford & Wrekin held on Thursday 21 May 2015 at 6.30pm at 'The Place', Oakengates, Telford, Shropshire**

#### **PRESENT:**

Councillors J.C. Ashford, S.L. Barnes, S. Bentley, K.T. Blundell, M. Boylan, A.J. Burford, S.P. Burrell, E.J. Carter, L.D. Carter, E.A. Clare, G.K. Cook, S. Davies, N.A. Dugmore, A.J. Eade, A.R.H. England, N.A.M. England, R.C. Evans, I.T.W. Fletcher, V.A. Fletcher, J.A. Francis, C.A. Furnival, E.J. Greenaway, K.R. Guy, M.B. Hosken, J. Jones, A. Lawrence, J. Loveridge, N.C. Lowery, C.N. Mason, A.D. McClements, A.A. Meredith, J.C. Minor, C.P.R. Mollett, L.A. Murray (Mayor), T.J. Nelson, R.A. Overton, J. Pinter, G.C.W. Reynolds, S.A.W. Reynolds, S.J. Reynolds, H. Rhodes, K.S. Sahota (Leader), P.J. Scott, J.M. Seymour, R.J. Sloan, C.F. Smith (Speaker), M.J. Smith, B.D. Tillotson, K.L. Tomlinson, W.L. Tomlinson, C.R. Turley, P.R. Watling and D.G. Wright.

#### **1. WELCOME FROM MAYOR**

The Mayor welcomed civic dignitaries, Members and invited guests to the Annual Meeting of the Borough of Telford & Wrekin. In particular he noted the presence of Lord & Lady Grocott; Lucy Allan MP and Freemen of the Borough Mrs Elizabeth Holt DL and Lieutenant Colonel Nick Jenkins representing The Rifles.

#### **2. DECLARATION**

Councillor A J Burford read the following declaration:

*“Colleagues, aware of our responsibilities to promote democracy and the well-being of all local people, on behalf of the Council, I make this re-commitment to our office as elected representatives.*

*Elected to serve the public good, we recognise that public office is a privilege granted by the people and not a right.*

*We, elected representatives of the people of Telford & Wrekin, declare that we will, to the best of our ability, uphold the Council’s constitution and serve the community above any private or personal interest.”*

Members signified their affirmation of the Declaration.

#### **3. APPOINTMENT OF MAYOR**

It was moved by Councillor M J Smith, seconded by Councillor R J Sloan, that Councillor L A Murray be elected as Mayor of the Council. Councillor A J Eade moved, seconded by Councillor I T W Fletcher that Councillor J A Francis be elected as Mayor. Following a vote it was :

**RESOLVED** – that Councillor L A Murray be elected as Mayor of the Council for the municipal year 2015/16.

**4. ELECTION OF SPEAKER**

It was moved by Councillor S A W Reynolds, seconded by Councillor E A Clare, that Councillor C F Smith be elected as Speaker of the Council. It was moved by Councillor N A Dugmore, seconded by Councillor J M Seymour that Councillor S Bentley be elected as Speaker. A vote was taken and it was:

**RESOLVED** – that Councillor C F Smith be elected as Speaker of the Council for the municipal year 2015/16.

**5. ELECTION OF DEPUTY SPEAKER**

It was moved by Councillor M J Smith, seconded by Councillor J Pinter, that Councillor R J Sloan be elected as Deputy Speaker of the Council. It was moved by Councillor S Bentley, seconded by Councillor J M Seymour, that Councillor I T W Fletcher be elected as Deputy Speaker. A vote was taken and it was:

**RESOLVED** – that Councillor R J Sloan be appointed as Deputy Speaker of the Council for the municipal year 2015/16.

**6. APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY MAYOR**

It was moved by Councillor S Davies, seconded by Councillor A J Burford, that Councillor J Pinter be appointed as Deputy Mayor. It was moved by Councillor E J Carter, seconded by Councillor N A Dugmore, that Councillor A A Meredith be appointed as Deputy Mayor. A vote was taken and it was:

**RESOLVED** – that Councillor J Pinter be appointed as Deputy Mayor of the Council for the municipal year 2015/16.

**7. VOTE OF THANKS TO RETIRING MAYOR & MAYORESS**

A vote of thanks to the retiring Mayor and Mayoress, Councillor M J Smith and Mrs Christine Smith, was proposed by Councillor E A Clare and seconded by Councillor R J Sloan. A number of other Members also paid tribute to the retiring Mayor for all his hard work in representing the Borough over the past year.

**RESOLVED** – that the Council recorded its thanks to the retiring Mayor, Councillor M J Smith for his service over the 2014/15 term of office.

**8. REPLY TO VOTE OF THANKS**

In response, the retiring Mayor thanked his wife Christine, the Deputy Mayor and Mayoral staff for their support during the year.

Over £8500 had been raised during the year for the Mayor's chosen charity, Arthritis Care. The Mayor had been overwhelmed by the support received during his year in

office and had very much enjoyed another term as Mayor, serving the Borough's communities.

#### **9. ELECTION OF LEADER**

It was moved by Councillor R A Overton, seconded by Councillor S Davies, that Councillor K S Sahota be elected Leader of the Council for a four year term of office. It was moved by Councillor S Bentley, seconded by Councillor N A Dugmore, that Councillor A J Eade be elected Leader of the Council for a four year term. Following a vote it was:

**RESOLVED – that Councillor K S Sahota be elected as Leader of the Council for a four year term of office from 2015/16 to 2018/19**

#### **10. APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY LEADER**

The Speaker confirmed that the Leader was appointing Councillor R A Overton as Deputy Leader for a four year term of office.

**RESOLVED – that Councillor R A Overton be appointed Deputy Leader for a four year period 2015/16 to 2018/19**

#### **11. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Councillor R.T. Kiernan.

#### **12. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

#### **13. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED - that the minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on 5 March 2015 be confirmed and signed by the Mayor.**

#### **14. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Mayor, Councillor L A Murray, told the meeting that he was very much looking to serving the Borough for another year as Mayor following his previous work as Mayor in 2013/14. He had selected three charitable causes. They were the Samaritans, Multiple Sclerosis care and Cottage Care.

Councillor K S Sahota, Leader of the Council, welcomed all guests and councillors to the meeting. He told the meeting that all Council's faced a difficult year ahead with continued budget reductions. His administration had worked hard to minimise the effect of the last five years' £70m budget reductions on front line services in the Borough. 1200 posts had been cut, Senior management costs reduced by 50% and

Cabinet Members had voluntarily reduced their allowances by 10% during the previous administration and would continue to do so. The Council had continued to support business and jobs. Councillor Sahota noted the significant successes of the previous four years. The Telford Loyalty Card, the Ice Rink refurbishment, the introduction of small business loans, the Southwater development, the £1m Pride fund, one of the first Council commercial Solar farms and winning the bid to bring the MOD logistics centre to Telford. Youth unemployment had been reduced and the Council continued to work hard to reduce it further.

For the future, he urged all councillors to work together for the benefit of the community. It was vital to recognise and support the work of staff, volunteers and carers throughout the Borough. Protecting 24/7 Accident & Emergency services at the Princess Royal Hospital was a priority. He paid tribute to David Wright, former MP for Telford, who had served the town admirably over 14 years. He looked forward to working with Lucy Allan, the new MP for Telford to serve the interests of the residents of the Borough.

Councillor A J Eade, leader of the Conservative group, noted that his party had attracted more votes across the Borough. He would work together to benefit the community but felt that the approach to planning needed to change radically. Development of green field sites should be stopped and the Council should consult and listen to local communities.

Councillor W L Tomlinson agreed that the green spaces of the Borough had been threatened too much. He called on the government to change planning policy to reduce the rush of planning applications. He would work with all groups to benefit the Borough.

## **15. APPOINTMENT OF CABINET**

Councillor K S Sahota, leader of the Council, welcomed Members and guests to the Annual meeting and notified the meeting of Cabinet appointments.

**RESOLVED** – that the Membership of the Cabinet, as notified by Councillor K S Sahota, be appointed for the municipal year 2015/16 as set out in Appendix 1 to these Minutes.

## **16. APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, ETC.**

Proposals for the appointment of Committees, Commissions and Boards, etc. in accordance with the political balance of the Council had been submitted.

**RESOLVED** – that the internal bodies for the municipal year 2015/16 (including the appointment of Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen) be appointed as set out in Appendix 2 to these Minutes.

**17. PROGRAMME OF ORDINARY MEETINGS OF THE COUNCIL**

The programme of dates for ordinary meetings of the Council for 2014/15 would be as follows:

Thursday, 9 July 2015 at The Whitehouse Hotel, Wellington

Thursday, 24 September 2015 at TCAT, Wellington

Thursday, 26 November 2014 at The Place, Oakengates

Thursday, 21 January 2015 at The Place, Oakengates

Thursday 3 March at The Place, Oakengates

Thursday, 5 May 2015 at The Place, Oakengates

The meeting ended at 8.02 pm

**Mayor:** .....

**Date:** .....

<b>APPOINTMENT OF CABINET FOR THE 2015/16 MUNICIPAL YEAR</b>
--

<b>Cabinet Member</b>	<b>Area of Responsibility</b>
Cllr K S Sahota	Leader
Cllr R A Overton	Deputy Leader & Cabinet Member for Health, Wellbeing & Housing
Cllr L D Carter	Council Finance & Service Delivery
Cllr E A Clare	Leisure & Culture
Cllr S Davies	Business, Neighbourhood & Customer Service
Cllr A R H England	Adult Social Care
Cllr A D McClements	Communities, Regeneration & Transport
Cllr G C W Reynolds	Employment & Skills
Cllr P R Watling	Children, Young People & Families

**GOVERNANCE**

<b>Standards Committee – 8 Seats</b>	
Cllr A J Burford (Lab) Cllr N A M England (Lab) <b>Cllr R J Sloan (Lab) – Vice Chair</b> <b>Cllr M J Smith (Lab) – Chair</b> Cllr P J Scott (Lib Dem/Ind) Conservative Nominee Conservative Nominee Conservative Nominee	

<b>Audit Committee – 8 Seats</b>	
Cllr I T W Fletcher (Con) Cllr K R Guy (Lab) Cllr A Lawrence (Con) Cllr S A W Reynolds (Lab) <b>Cllr R J Sloan (Lab) – Chair</b> <b>Cllr C F Smith (Lab) – Vice Chair</b> Cllr D G Wright (Con) Cllr W L Tomlinson (Lib Dem/Ind)	

<b>Council Constitution Committee – 8 Seats</b>	
Cllr A J Eade (Con) Cllr I T W Fletcher (Con) Cllr R A Overton (Lab) Cllr R J Sloan (Lab) <b>Cllr C F Smith (Lab) – Vice Chair</b> <b>Cllr M J Smith (Lab) – Chair</b> Cllr W L Tomlinson (Lib Dem/Ind) Conservative Nominee	

<b>Boundary Review Committee – 8 seats</b>	
Cllr E J Carter (Con) Cllr A J Eade (Con) Cllr K R Guy (Lab) <b>Cllr R A Overton (Lab) – Vice Chair</b> Cllr G C W Reynolds <b>Cllr R J Sloan (Lab) – Chair</b> Cllr K T Blundell (Lib Dem/Ind) Conservative Nominee	

## REGULATORY

<b>Planning Committee – 8 Seats</b>	
Cllr N A Dugmore (Con) Cllr E J Greenaway (Con) Cllr J Loveridge (Lab) Cllr N C Lowery (Con) <b>Cllr J C Minor (Lab) – Chair</b> Cllr M J Smith (Lab) <b>Cllr C R Turley (Lab) – Vice-Chair</b> Cllr P J Scott (Lib Dem/Ind)	<b><u>Labour Subs</u></b> Cllr K R Guy Cllr S A W Reynolds Cllr S J Reynolds Cllr H Rhodes  <b><u>Conservative Subs</u></b> Cllr I T W Fletcher Cllr R T Kiernan Cllr C P R Mollett

<b>Licensing Committee – 10 Seats</b>	
Cllr M Boylan (Con) Cllr G H Cook (Lab) Cllr I T W Fletcher (Con) Cllr J A Francis (Con) Cllr M B Hosken (Con) Cllr C N Mason (Lab) Cllr S J Reynolds (Lab) <b>Cllr H Rhodes (Lab) – Chair</b> Cllr J M Seymour (Con) <b>Cllr M J Smith (Lab) – Vice Chair</b>	<b><u>Labour Subs</u></b> Cllr J Jones Cllr J C Minor Cllr J A Pinter Cllr C F Smith Cllr C R Turley  <b><u>Conservative Subs</u></b> Cllr S P Burrell

## SCRUTINY

<b>Scrutiny Management Board – 8 Seats</b>	
Cllr S Bentley (Con) Cllr A J Burford (Lab) Cllr N A M England (Lab) Cllr V A Fletcher (Con) Cllr E J Greenaway (Con) Cllr K R Guy (Lab) <b>Cllr S A W Reynolds (Lab) - Chair</b> Cllr J M Seymour (Con)	

<b>Scrutiny Committee – Finance &amp; Enterprise – 8 Seats</b>	
Cllr S Bentley (Con) Cllr S P Burrell (Con) Cllr N A Dugmore (Con) Cllr R C Evans (Lab) <b>Cllr S A W Reynolds (Lab) – Chair</b> Cllr R J Sloan (Lab) Cllr C F Smith (Lab) Cllr D G Wright (Con)	

<b>Scrutiny Committee – Children &amp; Young People – 8 Seats</b>	
Cllr G H Cook (Lab) Cllr E J Greenaway (Con) <b>Cllr K R Guy (Lab) - Chair</b> Cllr J Loveridge (Lab) Cllr J A Pinter (Lab) Cllr K L Tomlinson (Lib Dem/Ind) Conservative Nominee Conservative Nominee	

<b>Scrutiny Committee – Customer, Community &amp; Partnership – 8 Seats</b>	
<b>Cllr N A M England (Lab) - Chair</b> Cllr K R Guy (Lab) Cllr S J Reynolds (Lab) Cllr J M Seymour (Con) Cllr C J Turley (Lab) Cllr P J Scott (Lib Dem/I) Conservative Nominee Conservative Nominee	

<b>Scrutiny Committee – Health &amp; Adult Care – 8 Seats</b>	
Cllr M Boylan (Con) <b>Cllr A J Burford (Lab) – Chair</b> Cllr V A Fletcher (Con) Cllr J Jones (Lab) Cllr J A Pinter (Lab) Cllr R J Sloan (Lab) Conservative Nominee Conservative Nominee	

<b>Joint Health &amp; Overview Scrutiny Committee – 3 Seats</b>	
<b>Cllr A J Burford (Lab) – Chair</b> Cllr V A Fletcher (Con) Cllr R J Sloan (Lab)	

**PERSONNEL**

<b>Appeals Committee – 8 Seats</b>	
Cllr J C Ashford (Con) <b>Cllr R C Evans (Lab) –Chair</b> Cllr J A Francis (Con) <b>Cllr K R Guy (Lab) – Vice Chair</b> Cllr C N Mason (Lab) Cllr A A Meredith (Con) Cllr C F Smith (Lab) Cllr K T Blundell (Lib Dem/Ind)	<b><u>Labour Subs</u></b> Cllr G H Cook Cllr H Rhodes Cllr M J Smith Cllr C R Turley  <b><u>Conservative Subs</u></b> Cllr S Bentley Cllr S P Burrell

<b>Personnel Committee – 8 Seats</b>	
Cllr S Bentley (Con) Cllr S Davies (Lab) Cllr N A Dugmore (Con) Cllr A J Eade (Con) Cllr K R Guy (Lab) <b>Cllr R A Overton (Lab) – Vice Chair</b> <b>Cllr K S Sahota (Lab) – Chair</b> Cllr K L Tomlinson (Lib Dem/Ind)	

## OTHER

<b>Health &amp; Wellbeing Board – 14 Seats</b>	
Cllr E A Clare	Cabinet Member – Leisure & Culture
P Taylor	Interim Director: Health, Wellbeing & Care, TWC
Cllr A R H England	Cabinet Member – Adult Social Care
D Evans	Chief Operating Officer, Telford & Wrekin CCG
Cllr K T Blundell	Lib Dem/Independent Group
D Harrison	Non-Executive Director, Telford & Wrekin CCG
<b>Dr M Innes – Vice Chair</b>	Chair, Telford & Wrekin CCG
L Johnston	Director for Children’s Services, TWC
<b>Cllr R A Overton – Chair</b>	Cabinet Member - Public Health
Cllr J M Seymour	Conservative Group
D Wickham	NHS Commissioning Board
Cllr P R Watling	Cabinet Member – Children, Young People & Families
E Noakes	Director of Public Health, TWC
J Chaplin	Healthwatch
J Tozer	Community Safety Partnership

<b>Combined Fire Authority</b>	
Cllr E J Carter (Con)	
Cllr I T W Fletcher (Con)	
Cllr R T Kiernan (Con)	
Cllr C N Mason (Lab)	
Cllr S J Reynolds (Lab)	
Cllr C R Turley (Lab)	

## **BOROUGH OF TELFORD & WREKIN**

### **Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Borough of Telford & Wrekin held on Thursday 21st May 2015 at 8.05 p.m. at 'The Place', Oakengates, Telford, Shropshire**

#### **18. HONORARY FREEMAN OF THE BOROUGH**

The Special Meeting of the Council had been convened specifically for the purpose of admitting Alan Olver as an Honorary Freeman of the Borough, he being a person of distinction who was considered to have rendered eminent service to Telford & Wrekin.

His admittance as an Honorary Freeman of the Borough was proposed by Councillor K S Sahota and seconded by Councillor A D McClements .

Councillor K.S. Sahota, Leader of the Council, spoke of Alan's work to develop the STAY project during the 1980's. The project offered much needed supported housing for 18-25 age group. Alan left his job to work on the Salvation Army's KIP project which measured the scale of the homelessness problem for the 26-60 age group who fell outside of the local authority's responsibility. In 2006 Alan had established Maninplace which provides temporary and longer term accommodation for a variety of needs. Alan had worked tirelessly to give people a better quality of life, really making a difference to people's lives and richly deserved this honour.

Councillor A D McClements spoke of Alan's compassion and understanding, allied to his non-judgemental approach to people encountering difficulties. He had worked tirelessly for many years and deserved the Borough's recognition for his outstanding work.

In response, Alan Olver told the meeting he was humbled by the support and commitment of all the colleagues who had worked with him through the years at the Council, Salvation Army, STAY project, YMCA, Kip Project and Maninplace project.

Members gave a standing ovation and , it was unanimously

**RESOLVED** – that Alan Olver be admitted as an Honorary Freeman of the Borough of Telford & Wrekin.

**MAYORAL ENGAGEMENTS**  
**23 May 2015 – 30 June 2015**

<b>May</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>M</b>	Costa Eco Pod Launch at Wrekin Retail Park, Telford
	<b>29</b>	<b>M</b>	Dawley Musical Theatre Group Summer Fayre at St Leonard's Church, Malinslee
	<b>31</b>	<b>M</b>	Telford Boccia Bowls Club Tournament at Abraham Darby Sports & Leisure Centre, Ironbridge Road, Madeley
<b>June</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>M</b>	11 <sup>th</sup> Signal & West Midlands Brigade Annual Reception at the Officers' Mess, Venning Barracks, Donnington
	<b>5</b>	<b>DM</b>	Wolverhampton School of Art Launch at University of Wolverhampton, Wolverhampton
	<b>6</b>	<b>DM</b>	Shrewsbury & Newport Canals Trust Open Day & AGM at Wappenshall Wharf, Wappenshall
		<b>DM</b>	Wooden Spoon Internation Tag Rugby Festival at Telford Hornets Rugby Club, Telford
	<b>7</b>	<b>DM</b>	Wolverhampton Civic Sunday at St Peter's Church, Wolverhampton
	<b>16</b>	<b>DM</b>	10 <sup>th</sup> Annual PDM Exhibition Official Opening at the International Centre, Telford
	<b>19</b>	<b>M</b>	Opportunity and Challenge of Old Age at Packwood Haugh School, Ruyton-XI-Towns, Shrewsbury
	<b>20</b>	<b>M</b>	Cottage Care Summer Fayre at Wellington Cottage Care Trust, Wellington
		<b>M</b>	Hadley & District Orpheus Male Voice Choir Charity Concert at The Place, Oakengates
<b>21</b>	<b>M</b>	Mayor's Civic Sunday at St Nicholas' Church, High Street, Newport	

# B

- 25**    **M**    Heritage Schools Celebration of Ketley History at Ketley Community Centre, Ketley
- 26**    **M**    Cottage Care Coffee Morning at Wellington Cottage Care Trust, Wellington
- M**    Maninplace Relocation Open Day at Maninplace, Queen Street, Wellington
- 27**    **M**    Opening of Chinese Arts & Culture Centre, Stafford Park 15, Telford
- 28**    **M**    Mayor's Civic Sunday at All Saint's Church, Wellington
- 29**    **M**    New College Telford Arch Block Opening at New College, Wellington

**TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL**

**COUNCIL – 9 July 2015**

**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 meetings on 26 February, 19 March and 25 June 2015.

**2.0 CABINET BUSINESS**

Matters that have been determined by Cabinet are listed below:

**2.1 26 February 2015**

- |    |       |   |
|----|-------|---|
| K  | 2.1.1 | Financial Monitoring 2014/15  |
| K  | 2.1.2 | Service & Financial Planning 2015/16 – 2017-18  |
| NK | 2.1.3 | Planning of School Places: Schools Changing their status and associated Transfer of Land and Assets |
| NK | 2.1.4 | Submission of Waters Upton Neighbourhood Development Plan   |
| K  | 2.1.5 | Declaration of the Extension to the Local Nature Reserve at Telford Town Park                       |
| NK | 2.1.6 | Declaration of Madeley Pitmounds Local Nature Reserve   |
| K  | 2.1.7 | Procurement Update  |

**2.2 19 March 2015**

- |     |        |   |
|-----|--------|---|
| K   | 2.2.1  | Scrutiny Review of Access to Affordable Housing                                     |
| K   | 2.2.2  | Scrutiny Review of Benefit Sanctions  |
| NK  | 2.2.3  | Pride in Your Community Programme – Investing in Our Infrastructure and Communities |
| NK  | 2.2.4  | Regeneration of Brookside Local Centre - Update                                     |
| NK  | 2.2.5  | Regeneration of Hollinswood Local Centre - Update                                   |
| NK  | 2.2.6  | The Gower, Gower St, St Georges - Update  |
| K   | 2.2.7  | Pride in Your High Streets and Local Centres  |
| K   | 2.2.8  | Madeley Neighbourhood Development Plan – Proceed to Making                          |
| K   | 2.2.9  | Update on Superfast Telford Broadband Programme                                     |
| K   | 2.2.10 | AFC Telford Utd Development Report  |
| NK  | 2.2.11 | Discretionary Housing Payment and Council Tax Support Hardship Assistance           |
| NK  | 2.2.12 | Tackling Youth Unemployment One Year On – The Second Year Challenge                 |
| K E | 2.2.13 | Southwater Phase 2 – Development Options  |

## 2.3 25 June 2015

- K C 2.3.1 Service & Financial Planning – 2014/15 Out-turn & 2015/16 Update
- K 2.3.2 Draft Telford & Wrekin Local Plan 2011 - 2031
- K 2.3.3 Draft Housing Allocation Policy & Tenancy Strategy for Telford & Wrekin
- K 2.3.4 Request for Delegated Powers to Designate Sections of Highway as Quiet Lanes or Home Zones
- K 2.3.5 Procurement Update
- NK 2.3.6 Annual Governance Statement 2014/15
- NK 2.3.7 Proposed Article 4(1) Direction for Haybridge Hall
- NK 2.3.8 Provision of Grant Funding to Facilitate the Restoration and Re-use of the former Charlton Arms Hotel, Wellington
- NK 2.3.9 Representation on Outside Bodies 2015/16

**Key**

- K = Key Decisions
- NK = Non-Key Decisions
- E = Exempt Items
- PE = Part Exempt Item
- C = Council
- PC = Part Recommendation to Council

### 3.0 DELEGATION OF POWERS GRANTED BY THE CABINET

REPORT HEADING	DELEGATION GRANTED TO	DETAIL OF DELEGATION GRANTED
Service & Financial Planning 2015/16-2017/18	<p>Assistant Director: Development, Business &amp; Employment</p> <p>Director: Neighbourhood, Customer &amp; Cultural Services</p>	<p>To deliver the planned programme of works within the Asset Management Plan</p> <p>To deliver the Highways and Transport capital investment programme in line with the approved budgets and to make any changes or variations to schemes in these programmes that remain within overall approved budgets, in consultation with appropriate Cabinet members.</p>
Planning of School Places: Schools Changing their Status and Associated Transfer of Land and Assets	Assistant Director: Education & Corporate Parenting	In consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People & Families to take all required actions and exercise all the Council's relevant powers to enable the changes of status to Trust Schools or Academies and associated transfers of land and assets to take place in respect of any school in the Borough.
Submission of Waters Upton Neighbourhood Development Plan	<p>Assistant Director: Planning Specialist</p> <p>Assistant Director: Planning Specialist</p>	<p>To exercise all the Council's relevant powers under the Town &amp; Country Planning Act 1990, the Planning &amp; Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 and all other enabling legislation, to take all necessary actions for the Waters Upton Neighbourhood Plan to be processed in accordance with the relevant legislation to and through the Independent Examination stage.</p> <p>To exercise all the Council's relevant powers under the Town &amp; Country Planning Act 1990, the Planning &amp; Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations, and all other enabling legislation,</p>

REPORT HEADING	DELEGATION GRANTED TO	DETAIL OF DELEGATION GRANTED
		regarding the neighbourhood planning process for future NDPs in the Borough up to but not including the stage where the Council needs to consider the recommendations of the Independent Examiner and decide whether the NDP can proceed to referendum.
Declaration of the Extension to the Local Nature Reserve at Telford Town Park	Assistant Director: Planning Specialist	In consultation with the Cabinet Members for Leisure Services & Culture and Housing, Development & Borough Towns, to complete the declaration process.
Declaration of Madeley Pitmounds Local Nature Reserve	Assistant Director: Planning Specialist	In consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing, Development & Borough Towns, to make any minor amendments to the boundaries of the Madeley Pitmounds Local Nature Reserve if required, and to complete the declaration process.
Procurement Update	Appropriate Officers	That the Procurement Intentions Document, as shown at Appendix A of the report, where appropriate, progress new procurements through the tender process to contract award be approved.
The Gower, Gower Street, St Georges Update	Assistant Director: Development, Business & Employment  Assistant Director: Development, Business & Employment	In consultation with the Cabinet Member: Neighbourhood, Employment & Skills, to review and, if acceptable, approve the final business plan  In consultation with the Cabinet Member: Neighbourhood, Employment & Skills, to implement a programme of refurbishment and governance structure when appropriate business plan is developed and agreed.

<p>Pride in Your High Streets and Local Centres</p>	<p>Assistant Director: Development, Business &amp; Employment</p> <p>Assistant Director: Leisure Culture &amp; Facilities Management</p>	<p>To oversee the administration and implementation of the Fund;</p> <p>In consultation with the Cabinet Member: Neighbourhood, Employment &amp; Skills and Assistant Director: Development, Business &amp; Employment, to oversee the investment of the £200k Innovation Fund in line with the proposals in the report.</p>
<p>Update on Superfast Telford Broadband Programme</p>	<p>Assistant Director: Development, Business &amp; Employment</p> <p>Assistant Director: Development, Business &amp; Employment</p>	<p>To take all actions necessary to finalise the funding package required to deliver the programme;</p> <p>To sign and execute any documentation necessary, including, but not limited to, awarding the contract to the preferred bidder.</p>
<p>AFC Telford Utd Development Report</p>	<p>Assistant Director: Development, Business &amp; Employment</p>	<p>In consultation with the Assistant Director: Leisure, Culture &amp; Facilities and the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood, Employment &amp; Skills and Finance &amp; Enterprise, to commit capital expenditure of up to £279K to support projects in line with those referred to in the report upon agreement of an acceptable business plan.</p>
<p>Southwater Phase Two – Development Options</p>	<p>Assistant Director: Development, Business &amp; Employment</p> <p>Assistant Director: Development, Business &amp; Employment</p>	<p>To conclude an options appraisal for the provision of a hotel and associated car parking development on land at Southwater and car parking facilities to support the development of apartments at Southwater as part of the Housing &amp; Property Investment Programme and, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance &amp; Enterprise, to proceed with the implementation of the preferred option;</p> <p>In consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance &amp; Enterprise, to conclude negotiations with private sector partners to facilitate delivery</p>

	Assistant Director: Development, Business & Employment	including entering into any agreements necessary for the disposal of or acquisition of land required to give effect to the recommendations within the report.  In consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance & Enterprise, to enter into any agreements necessary to secure the design and construction of the car parking facilities
Draft Housing Allocation Policy and Tenancy Strategy for Telford & Wrekin	Assistant Director: Development, Business & Employment	In consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing, Public Health & Protection, to update the documents. Any significant changes following external consultation will be brought back to Cabinet before the documents are finalised and published.
Request for Delegated Powers to Designate Sections of Highway as Quiet Lanes or Home Zones	Assistant Director: Neighbourhood & Customer Services	In consultation with the Cabinet Member: Communities, Regeneration & Transport, for the designation of Quiet Lanes and Home Zones in accordance with powers given to the Council by the Transport Act 2000 and the Quiet Lanes and Home Zone (England) Regulations 2006.
Proposed Article 4(1) Direction for Haybridge Hall	Director: Neighbourhood , Customer & Cultural Services  Director: Neighbourhood, Customer & Cultural Services	In consultation with the Cabinet Member: Housing, Public Health & Protection, to determine whether a Direction (with or without immediate effect) should be made under Article 4(1) of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) 2015 to remove permitted development rights under Schedule 2, Part 11, Class B (Demolition of Buildings) from the site at Haybridge Hall Flats, Haybridge Road, Hadley  In consultation with the Cabinet Member: Housing, Public Health & Protection, to make the Direction referred to in paragraph 2.1 of the report;

	Director: Neighbourhood, Customer & Cultural Services	To exercise all the powers conferred on the Council regarding the making, processing and confirmation of the Direction referred to in paragraph 2.1 of the report.
Provision of Grant Funding to Facilitate the Restoration and Re-use of the Former Charlton Arms Hotel, Wellington	Director: Neighbourhood, Customer & Cultural Services	To enter into the proposed grant agreement referred to in the report.
<b>LEGAL COMMENT</b> <b>FINANCIAL COMMENT</b> <b>LINKS WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES</b> <b>RISKS AND OPPORTUNITIES</b> <b>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT</b> <b>EQUALITY &amp; DIVERSITY</b> <b>WARD IMPLICATIONS</b>	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**

**CABINET – 25 JUNE 2015  
COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2015**

**SERVICE & FINANCIAL PLANNING – 2014/15 OUTTURN AND 2015/16  
UPDATE**

**REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR: FINANCE, AUDIT &  
INFORMATION GOVERNANCE (CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER)**

**LEAD CABINET MEMBER: CLLR LEE CARTER**

**PART A) – SUMMARY REPORT**

**1.0 SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES**

**1.1 2014/15 Financial Outturn**

The Council has a strong track record of very effective financial management and in anticipation of the inevitable funding cuts to be faced in 2015/16 and later years action was taken early in 2014/15 to identify and deliver further “in year” savings. This together with an embedded culture of tight budget control and active financial management by both Cabinet Members and budget holders has resulted in a very sound financial position at the end of the 2014/15 financial year.

The gross revenue budget for 2014/15 was £429m and the net budget was £129m. The revenue outturn position is well within budget with a final net underspend of £1.145m (which is equivalent to only -0.89% of net budget) - £0.858m of this is a planned funding required for the 2015/16 budget strategy as agreed in the service and financial planning strategy by Full Council on 5 March 2015. This position has been achieved after delivering £17m of budget savings in 2014/15, on top of the £53m made in the previous 5 years.

The focus of Cabinet Members and the Senior Management Team has been to maximise the financial position for the Council through the 2014/15 closedown in order to put us in the best possible position as we move into 2015/16. Action taken has included capitalisation of interest relating to capital projects under construction which is permissible under the local government accounting code of practice, a review of all balances and provisions and in recognition of current very low inflation rates a review of budget allowances for inflation. This action has resulted in additional one-off revenue benefits which are available to support the medium term financial strategy. The funding outlook for the medium term will undoubtedly continue to be extremely challenging and whilst until the Government publish further details later

in the year following their Comprehensive Spending Review, it is not possible to have any certainty on the further cuts that we will face, it is currently anticipated that we will need to identify further savings of between £10m and £12m each year for at least the next 3 years, based on current national planning totals.

Due to the strong financial management exercised by Cabinet Members and budget holders during 2014/15, the Council has been able to make a number of investments and create prudent provisions from the 2014/15 underspend to support its priorities. These include the one-off investments approved as part of the 2015/16 budget strategy:-

- £1.0m to help revitalise and invest in the high streets of borough towns;
- £0.750m to support the borough wide environmental maintenance programme;
- £0.2m to provide free swimming for residents over 50;

Further investments now funded from the 2014/15 out-turn position include:-

- £0.8m to allow the Parish Environmental Teams and rapid Response team to continue to operate until the end of the current cleansing and grounds maintenance contract in March 2019;
- £0.5m to support the Council's Job Box Initiative beyond the current financial year
- £1m funding to support the Pride in Your Community Fund initiative planned for 2017/18 (previously funded through prudential borrowing). Funding from the available revenue funds from 2014/15 will enable greater flexibility in the schemes that can be supported rather than using capital funds and reduce ongoing debt charges;
- £2.2m provision for future severance costs as further staffing reductions will be unavoidable as part of the ongoing service reviews required to deliver the savings required due to further cuts imposed by the Government.
- £1m to provide additional capacity and to support invest to save initiatives which will help to deliver future budget savings

Our pro-active approach secured a number of favourable variations during the year which contributed to the overall favourable position. These included:

- In year savings totalling £5.2m were delivered across all services which contributed significantly to the overall outturn position. This included many one-off benefits, for example arising from active treasury management where a back-dated benefit of £1.1m has been achieved from reviewing the Council's MRP policy relating to "government supported" debt in the same way as was agreed for all

prudential debt as part of the budget in 2014/15. Also included is the budget in 2014/15 allowed for the implementation of the single status settlement which was not implemented during 2014/15 and released a benefit of £1.95m.

- Close management of employee budgets during the year has resulted in savings totalling £2.1m relating to vacant posts, many of which are one off and linked to service restructures
- Public Health costs relating to smoking cessation and substance misuse have ended the year under budget by £0.5m
- A one off benefit of £0.2m relating to Planning Fee income due to the buoyant housing market, inward investment and business expansion

The main pressures experienced during 2014/15 were:

- Adult Social Services ended the year at £0.6m overspend. As reported throughout the year, the cost of purchasing care packages from external providers was the key issue with an overspend of £5.6m. One off balances of £3.1m and additional income of £1.7m, including Government grants, partly offset the overspend.
- Children's Safeguarding ended the year with an overspend of £1.2m. This was a combination of the cost of Children in Care Placements, which had an overspend of £1.6m at year end, and other service overspends including care leavers accommodation costs, the cost of using agency staff; foster care and adoption costs; these were offset by the use of the £1.2m draw down budget and other service underspends.

## **1.2 Capital**

Capital spend ended the year at £115.1m against an approved estimate of £141.6m which was in the main due to re-phasing into 2015/16. This underspend will enable some treasury management savings to be made in 2015/16.

## **1.3 Income Monitoring**

Overall cash collection is in a good position. Collection rates for Council Tax (£68m) and business Rates (£72m) were ahead of target for the year while sales ledger income collection (£36m) was slightly behind the target for the year. Debt is pursued rigorously and continues to be collected after the end of the financial year with all recovery avenues being explored.

## **1.4 General**

The draft formal statement of accounts will be available in July as KPMG begin the external audit and will also be available for public inspection for 20 working days from 2 July.

- 1.5** Summaries of the outturn on revenue and capital along with major variations are shown as appendices to this report.

### 1.6 2015/16 Update

The Council faces another very challenging year in 2015/16 and a number of key issues are already highlighted in this first high level review of the budget position. Once the final accounts are completed more detailed new year monitoring will take place and a further, more detailed, report will be brought to the July meeting of the Cabinet with an updated position.

## 2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 In relation to the 2014/15 Financial Outturn, Members are asked to approve the following recommendations which will go forward to Full Council for approval:

- (i) The Revenue outturn position and related virements in Appendix 3 for 2014/15 which is subject to audit by the Council's external auditors; also, the transfers to reserves detailed in paragraph 5.3.
- (ii) Approve the Capital outturn position and related supplementary estimates, virements and re-phasing shown in Appendix 4 as summarised in the report.
- (iii) Note the performance against income targets.
- (iv) Note the key issues identified for 2015/16 and approve the new capital allocation detailed in paragraph 8.2.

## 3.0 SUMMARY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

<b>COMMUNITY IMPACT</b>	Do these proposals contribute to specific Priority Plan objective(s)?	
	Yes	Delivery of all priority objectives depend on the effective use of available resources. Financial management ensures best use of resources.
<b>TARGET COMPLETION/DELIVERY DATE</b>	Outturn forms the basis of the formal statement of accounts which will be presented to the Audit Committee in draft format at the end of June, are audited during July and the final version of which will be published by the end of September following consideration by the Audit Committee.	
<b>FINANCIAL/VALUE FOR MONEY IMPACT</b>	Yes	The financial impacts are detailed throughout the report.

<b>LEGAL ISSUES</b>	No	None directly arising from this report. The S151 Officer has a statutory duty to monitor income and expenditure and to take action if overspends /shortfalls emerge. There is a requirement to publish the audited Statement of Accounts by the end of September and the draft accounts should be presented to the Audit Committee before the end of June.
<b>OTHER IMPACTS, RISKS &amp; OPPORTUNITIES</b>	No	
<b>IMPACT ON SPECIFIC WARDS</b>	No	Borough Wide

## **PART B) – ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

### **4.0 2014/15 REVENUE BUDGET**

- 4.1** The Council had a gross revenue budget of £429m for 2014/15 and the final net revenue outturn position is as follows (a summary is provided in Appendix I):

	£m
Net Budget	129.234
Net Expenditure	128.089
Net Underspend	-1.145
Percentage Net Variance	-0.89

- 4.2** Variations by Service Delivery Unit are summarised below and further detail is provided in Appendix 2.

Service Area	Approved Budget £	Outturn £	Variance £
Children's Safeguarding & Specialist Services	20,498,422	<b>21,697,262</b>	1,198,840
Education & Corporate Parenting	10,884,147	<b>11,403,743</b>	519,596
Family, Cohesion & Commissioning Services	9,713,047	<b>8,808,046</b>	(905,001)
Development, Business & Employment	2,369,583	<b>1,891,640</b>	(477,943)
Neighbourhood & Leisure Services	30,643,265	<b>30,173,408</b>	(469,857)
Adult Social Services	37,528,318	<b>38,196,188</b>	667,870
Public Health, Well Being & Public Protection	2,005,078	<b>1,601,157</b>	(403,921)
Customer Services	4,764,596	<b>4,113,644</b>	(650,952)
Law, Democracy & People Services	2,329,380	<b>253,026</b>	(2,076,354)
Finance, Audit & Information Governance	9,615,330	<b>7,249,830</b>	(2,365,500)
Cooperative Council Delivery Unit	1,327,580	<b>1,207,668</b>	(119,912)
Council Wide (including Asset Rentals)	(2,444,216)	<b>(4,006,398)</b>	(1,562,182)
<b>Total</b>	<b>129,234,530</b>	<b>122,589,214</b>	<b>(6,645,316)</b>
Proposed Transfers to Reserves:			
Capacity/Invest to Save Fund		1,000,000	1,000,000
Severance Fund		2,200,000	2,200,000
Pride in Your Community Fund 17/18		1,000,000	1,000,000
Parish Environmental Teams (17/18 and 18/19)		800,000	800,000
Unemployment Initiatives		500,000	500,000
<b>Total Variance after Transfers</b>	<b>129,234,530</b>	<b>128,089,214</b>	<b>(1,145,316)</b>

Note: the above figures include both service and corporate variances (such as asset rentals and pensions accounting entries required by International Accounting Standard 19) - the detailed analysis is shown in Appendix 2. The figures are also before impairment costs which will be finalised for the production of the Statement of Accounts – these are technical accounting entries which are reversed out in the Income & Expenditure Account and do not impact on the overall outturn position shown above but which are required by accounting regulations that the Council must comply with. Therefore the position in the published accounts will differ from that set out above.

4.3 Service variances over £0.100m are highlighted below.

Service Area	Variance £m
<b><u>Children's Safeguarding &amp; Specialist Services</u></b>	
<b>Children in Care Placements (CiC)</b> – the overspend reflects 293 CiC (309 at 31 March 2014, peak of 323 during last financial year). The financial strategy for 2014/15 included an additional “draw-down” budget for Safeguarding to help meet the ongoing pressures on the service (see below). All placements are scrutinised and reviewed in line with the Action Plan and Placement Strategy to secure best value. The Cost Improvement Plan for 2015/16 includes further cost reductions in this area.	+1.558

<p><b>Draw down budget</b> – £1.2m set aside when the budget was set to meet CiC pressures.</p>	-1.200
<p><b>Care Leavers</b> – overspend relating to the cost of supporting 16-18 year olds as they leave care. This represents a significant improvement on the position in 2013/14.</p>	+0.166
<p><b>Internal Foster Carer Costs</b>– payments to Foster Carers including transport costs.</p>	+0.164
<p><b>Staffing (Specialist Services)</b> – underspends from vacancies held in the service area.</p>	-0.116
<p><b>Staffing (Safeguarding)</b> – including the cost of agency social workers</p>	+0.237
<p><b>Direct Payments</b> – payments relating to personal care for children with disabilities.</p>	+0.105
<p><b>Children not in Care</b> – costs relating to adoption fees and other costs made to carers to support placing children with families and avoiding higher care related costs.</p>	+0.190
<p>In year savings total £0.080m.</p>	
<p><b><u>Education &amp; Corporate Parenting</u></b></p>	
<p><b>School Improvement Advisory Service</b> – lower costs due to in year vacancies and additional income from trading following a restructure.</p>	-0.246
<p><b>Education Services Grant (ESG)</b> – fewer in-year conversions to academies than anticipated resulting in less reduction in ESG for the local authority.</p>	-0.105
<p>In year savings total £0.130m.</p>	
<p><b><u>Family, Cohesion Services &amp; Commissioning</u></b></p>	
<p><b>Cohesion</b> – a combination of salary savings from temporary vacancies and other savings within the service.</p>	-0.206
<p><b>Contracting &amp; Commissioning</b> – mainly due to the transfer of Supporting People from Adult Social Services which is forecast to overspend by £0.384m, partially offset by restructure savings.</p>	+0.303
<p>In year savings total £0.909m.</p>	

<b><u>Adult Social Services</u></b>	
<b>Purchasing budgets</b> – an overspend of £5.6m is reported which is after the delivery of £2m savings already achieved.	+5.573
<b>One off Funds</b> – includes £0.9m Service balances plus £2.24m of the one off draw down budget set aside at year end.	-3.140
<b>Transport</b> – impact of the budget reductions following a transport review. A project group has been set up to review transport expenditure in 2015/16 and address the overspend.	+0.179
<b>Employees</b> – savings arising from vacant posts within Adult Social Services.	-0.304
<b>Income</b> – a combination of additional income from the Government to support work on winter pressures and reducing the delay to people leaving hospital, together with funds to support the implementation of the Care Act and additional client contributions.	-1.742
<b><u>Public Health, Wellbeing &amp; Public Protection</u></b>	
<b>Employees</b> – arising from part year vacancies and underspends on other employee budgets.	-0.102
<b>Smoking Cessation Project</b> – saving arising from reduced demand and use of service.	-0.231
<b>Substance Misuse</b> – saving from across the Drugs and Alcohol service including inpatient detox.	-0.252
<b>Public Protection &amp; Civil Resilience</b> – saving arising from employee vacancies during the year	-0.145
In year savings total £0.200m.	
<b><u>Neighbourhood &amp; Leisure Services</u></b>	
<b>Highways &amp; Engineering</b> – costs associated with restructure	+0.200
<b>Highways &amp; Engineering</b> – additional income which cover costs associated with restructure	-0.307
<b>Drain Clearing</b> – additional costs of gully emptying; offset by	+0.143

underspends elsewhere in the service.	
<b>Concessionary Travel</b> – saving as a result of reduced passenger numbers.	-0.126
<b>Highways &amp; Transport Strategic Policy</b> – savings arising from vacant posts	-0.225
<b>Highways &amp; Transport Strategic Policy</b> – income shortfall mitigated by above saving.	+0.169
<b>Leisure Facilities &amp; Services</b> – income shortfall at Oakengates Leisure Centre and Horsehay Golf Complex	+0.175
<b>Arthog</b> – additional income relating to increased school visits and increased occupancy.	-0.138
<b>Oakengates Theatre</b> – additional income relating to the success of the pantomime and other productions during the year.	-0.100
In year savings total £0.185m.	
<b><u>Development, Business &amp; Employment</u></b>	
<b>Regeneration &amp; Investments</b> – loss in Property Investment Portfolio investment income arising from the longer-term rationalisation of the property portfolio to secure a more sustainable income position ongoing, short-term income pressures at Southwater car park and service charge voids.	+0.575
<b>Business &amp; Development Planning</b> – one off savings arising from vacancy management	-0.123
<b>Development Management</b> – one off benefit from increased planning applications due to the current housing market and “Invest in Telford” campaign.	-0.218
<b>Property &amp; Design</b> – one off savings arising from vacancy management	-0.126
<b>Property &amp; Design</b> – reduced spend on consultancy services	-0.114
<b>Property &amp; Design</b> – additional property related costs including utilities and maintenance costs	+0.216
<b>Regeneration &amp; Investment</b> – one off savings arising from vacancy management	-0.147

In year savings total £0.440m.	
<p><b><u>Customer Services</u></b></p> <p><b>Care &amp; Enablement</b> – savings identified from staffing restructures and the cessation of the enablement service which together with one off funds have covered residential and community support overspends</p> <p><b>ICT</b> – the net impact of the reallocation of savings together with additional restructure savings.</p> <p><b>Cleaning</b> – additional income generated and reduced employee costs.</p> <p>Customer Services overall position includes £600k additional funding achieved through increased council tax and business rates. Due to accounting regulations this is not available to the Council in 2014/15 and will be met from one-off funds until 2015/16.</p> <p>In year net savings total £0.256m.</p>	<p>-0.251</p> <p>-0.134</p> <p>-0.102</p>
<p><b><u>Finance, Audit &amp; Information Governance</u></b></p> <p><b>Treasury</b> – the majority of this saving relates to the benefit of extending the change in the calculation of the Minimum Revenue Provision applied in 2013/14 to include supported debt (government allocations), which is made up of a back-dated element of £1.1m and an ongoing benefit. The revenue impact of changes to the level of anticipated capital receipts is also reflected in this position as is a benefit from capitalisation of interest on projects under construction at year end.</p>	-2.149
<p><b><u>Law, Democracy &amp; People Services</u></b></p> <p><b>Single Status</b> - the budget for 2014/15 allowed for implementation of the single status settlement during the year. This is unlikely to happen during this financial year and as such a net benefit of £1.9m will arise during this year.</p> <p>In year net savings total £1.917m.</p>	-1.950
<p><b><u>Co-operative Council Delivery Unit</u></b></p> <p><b>Delivery &amp; Planning</b> – underspends relating to vacant posts.</p> <p>In year savings total £0.087m.</p>	-0.101

<b><u>Purchase Rebates</u></b> Surplus dividend from West Mercia Energy relating to 2013/14 outturn performance.	-0.132
<b><u>Litigation Costs</u></b> Provision for the estimated costs associated with an ongoing litigation claim affecting a number of Councils across the country.	+0.259
<b><u>Housing Benefit Subsidy</u></b> Higher than budgeted housing benefit subsidy which includes the impact of a reduction in the level of overpayments made during the last part of the year.	-0.211

#### 4.4 Public Health.

Responsibility for Public Health transferred to the Council from the NHS in April 2013 together with the associated specific ring-fenced grant funding. In 2014/15 this grant totalled £10.9m. The conditions of the grant are that it must be used to address health needs and improve health and well-being in the community. Improving public health outcomes is delivered across a number of Service Areas and a summary of the application of the grant in 2014/15 is shown in the table below:

	£
Public Health Reserve (grant cfwd 13/14)	31,000
Public Health Grant 2014/15	<u>10,912,900</u>
Total Funding	<u><u>10,943,900</u></u>
 <u>Application of Funding in 2014/15</u>	
Public Health, Well Being & Public Protection	6,812,457
Adult Social Services	967,790
Customer Services	36,726
Development, Business & Employment	574,721
Education & Corporate Parenting	491,999
Family & Cohesion & Commissioning Services	1,240,314
Neighbourhood & Leisure Services	556,600
Council Wide	<u>151,131</u>
	<u><u>10,831,738</u></u>
 Grant cfwd into 2015/16	 <u><u>112,162</u></u>

The majority of the grant was allocated to Services during the year, with the exception of £0.581m which was applied to eligible expenditure at year end (£0.312m to Education & Corporate Parenting; £0.060m to Development, Business & Employment, in addition to £0.016m of 2013/14 grant carried forward; £0.030m to Family & Cohesion; £0.140 to Neighbourhood & Leisure and £0.040 Council wide) and therefore appears as additional income in these areas as it was not included in the budget. Overall, including the balance carried forward to 2015/16 in accordance with the grant conditions, the grant was fully spent in 2014/15.

## **5.0 RESERVES & BALANCES**

**5.1** The main General and Special Fund balances were £3.224m at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2014. As part of the budget process a further risk based evaluation of all balances will be undertaken to provide an updated view of balances available for the budget strategy. It is anticipated that this is likely to generate a slightly greater figure as being available to support future service and financial planning strategies.

**5.2** The position on the main General and Special Fund Balances is:

	£m
Balances at 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2014	<b>3.224</b>
Contribution to General Fund Balances - 14/15 underspend. However £0.858m of this is required to fund the service and financial planning strategy for 2015/16 approved by Full Council in March 2015.	1.145
<b>Balances at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2015</b>	<b>4.369</b>

The General/Special Fund balance forms part of the Council's overall reserves and balances.

In addition to the General and Special Fund Balances, the Council holds a number of contingencies available to support services in 2015/16. These include:-

- £2.500m specifically set aside to support Adult Social care services,
- £0.750m specifically for children's safeguarding and a
- £2.776m general contingency to provide further support to Adults and children's safeguarding or for other services if required.

**5.3** The following specific transfers to reserves are proposed:-

	<u>£m</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pride in Your Community Fund – 2017/18 – the positive overall position provides the opportunity to fund the already approved scheme for 2017/18 from the 2014/15 underspend rather than from prudential borrowing.</li> </ul>	1.000
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parish Environmental Teams – this will extend the funding for these teams to include 2017/18 and 2018/19 after which the service will be considered as part of the retender for cleansing and grounds maintenance services.</li> </ul>	0.800
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unemployment Initiatives Fund - we have achieved significant reductions in youth unemployment through the first year of the Youth Unemployment Programme which is already funded to continue in the current financial year. A number of elements of the programme have been incredibly successful and are proposed to be expanded including the work of the Job Box Mentors where it is proposed to extend the focus to include ex armed forces personnel and support for over 50s. The proposed additional funding will enable these initiatives to continue beyond the end of 2015/16.</li> </ul>	0.500
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Severance Fund –this fund supports the delivery of ongoing savings.</li> </ul>	2.200
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity Fund – to provide one off resources required for service development and the delivery of savings.</li> </ul>	1.000
<b>Total</b>	<b>5.500</b>

Within the overall outturn position funds have also been set aside to create a corporate ICT reserve totalling £1.5m. This will support essential investment in ICT infrastructure and kit as part of the overall ICT and customer services strategy which is integral to the future delivery of many savings as well as enhancing our customers experience of doing business with us. A treasury provision of £0.140m has also been created (utilising less than 10% of the in-year treasury management surplus) to cover anticipated costs necessary to maximise the council's future treasury management position and some one-off costs associated with the change of the Council's bankers.

## 6.0 2014/15 CAPITAL PROGRAMME

6.1 The capital programme for 2014/15 was £141.6m; spend at year end was £115.1m giving a year end variation of £26.3m which is summarised in the table below:

Service Area	Budget	Spend	% Spend	Year End Variance
	£m	£m	£m	£m
Education & Corporate Parenting	64.81	58.02	90%	-6.79
Development, Business & Employment	37.16	22.61	61%	-14.55
Neighbourhood & Leisure Services	31.27	28.81	92%	-2.46
Adult Social Services	1.85	0.37	20%	-1.48
Customer Services	2.36	1.76	75%	-0.60
Cooperative Council Delivery Unit	4.04	3.69	91%	-0.35
Council Wide	0.12	0.00	0%	-0.12
<b>Total</b>	<b>141.61</b>	<b>115.26</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>-26.35</b>

Note: the budget includes the new allocations detailed in Appendix 4

6.2 The main scheme delays/re-phasing to 2014/15 are shown below with detail included in Appendix 4.

	£m
<b><u>Education &amp; Corporate Parenting</u></b>	
Building Schools for the Future: amendments to phasing; contracts have now been signed and the majority of works will complete at some point during 2015/16	-6.8
<b><u>Development, Business &amp; Employment</u></b>	
Housing Investment Programme – delays relating to incorporating the company has led to rephasing.	-2.9
Superfast Broadband – spend re-profiled; fully committed over the next 2 years	-1.2
Brookside – rephasing; project expected to be complete early in 2015/16.	-1.0
Green Deal – National project deadline extended to September 2015 resulting in rephasing.	-2.4
Hollinswood Regeneration – contract awarded in March 2015; work scheduled to be completed	-1.3

during 2015/16.  Schools – various schemes rephased to and fully committed in 2015/16.	-2.9
<b><u>Neighbourhood &amp; Leisure Services</u></b>  Highways Maintenance, Bridges & Integrated Transport – final work on Station Link/Box Road completed in April 2015.	-1.9
<b><u>Adult Social Services</u></b>  Day Opportunities for Adults with Learning Disabilities – rephasing linked to Hollinswood Centre regeneration mentioned above.  Social Care ICT Review – rephasing of programme	-0.9  -0.4

6.3 There are a number of new approvals and virements which are also detailed in Appendix 4 and require formal approval.

6.4 Appendix 5 includes details of Section 106 agreements agreed during 2014/15.

**7.0 CORPORATE INCOME MONITORING**

7.1 The Council's budget includes significant income streams which are regularly monitored to ensure they are on track to achieve targets that have been set and so that remedial action can be taken at a very early stage. The three main areas are Council Tax, NNDR (business rates) and Sales Ledger. Current monitoring information relating to these is provided below. The Council pursues outstanding debt vigorously, until all possible recovery avenues have been exhausted, but also prudently provides for bad debts in its accounts.

7.2 In summary, the overall position shows collection levels is ahead of target for council tax and NNDR however behind the target set for sales ledger. Cash collection remains in a very good position.

<b>INCOME COLLECTION – March 2015</b>				
	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Performance</b>	<b>Change in cash collected on last year</b>
<b>Collection Levels:</b>				
Council Tax Collection	96.7%	96.6%	0.10% ahead of target	+ £2,125,742
NNDR Collection	97.5%	97.3%	0.2% ahead of target	N/A
Sales Ledger Outstanding Debt	8.46%	5.50%	2.96% behind target	+4,911,490

### 7.3 Council Tax (£68.6m)

The percentage of the current year liability for council tax which the authority should have received during the year, as a percentage of annual collectable debit. The measure does not take account of debt that continues to be pursued and collected after the end of the financial year in which it became due. The final collection figure for all financial years exceeds 98.5%.

Year end performance 2013/14	96.6%
Year End Target for 2014/15	96.6%

Performance is cumulative during the year and expressed against the complete year's debit.

Year End Target	Year End Actual	Last year Actual
96.6%	96.7%	96.6%

Council Tax collection has out turned at 96.7%, which compares to 96.6% for same point last year. This is a really pleasing result for year two of the Council Tax Support scheme as it becomes increasingly difficult to seek repayment from benefit customers who already have payment arrangements in place for year one of the scheme. Over the next few months national statistics will be released so we'll be able to benchmark our performance against others.

We have collected £2.1 million more this year compared to last year.

### 7.4 NNDR-Business Rates (£71.9m)

The % of business rates for 2014/15 that should have been collected during the year. This target, as for council tax, ignores our continuing collection of earlier years' liabilities.

The measure does not take into account the debt that continues to be pursued and collected after the end of the financial year in which it became due. As a general rule the final collection figure for any financial year exceeds 99%.

Year end performance 2013/14	97.3%
Year End Target for 2014/15	97.3%

Year End Target	Year End Actual	Last year Actual
97.3%	97.5%	97.3%

For NDR, we have collected almost £2.5 million more in 2014/15 than the previous year. Collection has out turned at 97.5% compared to 97.3 at the same time last year. Collection for businesses rates can tend to

fluctuate according to the national economy, so collection should continue to rise next year if the national economy stays strong.

**7.5 Sales Ledger (£36.5m)**

This includes general debt and Social Care debt. Debt below 2 months is classified as a normal credit period.

The target percent is set relating cumulative debt outstanding from all years to the current annual debit. The targets and performance of income collection for 2014/15 are as follows:

Age of debt	Annual Target %	March 2015	
		£m	%
Total	5.50	3.09	8.46%

Sales ledger performance is outside target. This is mainly due to a number of large invoices which are currently being actively pursued by the Revenues Service and Assistant Directors across the organisation. These invoices will continue to be actively pursued over the next few weeks.

**8.0 2015/16 UPDATE**

The first detailed monitoring report for 2015/16 will be considered at Cabinet in July. However, this section of the report will give an early indication of some emerging issues for the new financial year, informed where relevant, by the closedown position reported above. Inevitably, early focus is on areas of potential pressure and managers are now taking action to seek ways to minimise these pressures and to identify ways to mitigate remaining issues.

**8.1 Revenue**

**Adult Social Services/Childrens Safeguarding**

It is expected that the Council will continue to experience financial pressure in relation to both Adults and Childrens' social care services and a £2.5m contingency was therefore created to help support adult social care services during the year with a separate fund of £0.75m being available to support childrens' safeguarding. Both service areas have developed cost improvement plans to deliver ongoing reductions in expenditure to address these pressures during 2015/16 and deliver a sustainable financial position.

Demand management, culture change , innovative delivery options and partnership working, especially via the Better Care Fund and associated initiatives, will be key to the success of these cost improvement plans. Close monitoring of the progress of these plans will be undertaken by both senior management and Members on a regular basis throughout the year

### **Care & Enablement In house Services**

2015/16 is the first year that internal Care & Enablement Services are formally trading with an income target of £4.7m which is charged to Adult Social Services for care provided to Adults with Learning Disabilities and to a slowly emerging self funders market. Adult Social Services are undertaking a full review of care packages with the aim of reducing their costs which will result in lower income for Care & Enablement Services. This is therefore a risk and the service will have to respond and make adjustments which will include the need for consultation as part of those adjustments and will very likely result in a further restructure of the business. Figures will be firmed up for the next financial monitoring.

### **ICT**

As the authority moves to more mobile working and is promoting channel shift, the number of Microsoft licences required has increased by around 500 which equates to an additional cost of around £0.147m .

### **Development, Business and Employment**

Business growth through inward investment and business expansions are expected to continue in 2015/16 with 38 live enquiries. This will have a positive impact on job creation but also business rate growth and planning fees. It is anticipated that the Housing market will remain buoyant with a positive impact on planning fees and New Homes Bonus.

The position on all income budgets will be closely monitored during the year and remedial action taken where possible, with any significant variances reported through the Service & Financial Planning process during the year.

### **Leisure & Culture**

The income targets for the leisure centres for 2015/16 are challenging. The ongoing BSF building works at Oakengates continues and is likely to impact on income generation at this facility. However, Leisure income is closely monitored, and management action taken where possible. The new Aspirations suite at Horsehay was successfully opened in May 2015. Any significant variances will be reported through the Service & Financial Planning process during the year.

## **8.2 Capital**

The Council received notification on the 24<sup>th</sup> March 2015 that the bid for funding for the Telford Town Centre Connectivity Package has been successful. The scheme has a total estimated cost of £12.303m, of which £10.335m will be met from DfT Challenge Fund grant. The match funding of £1.968m will be funded from S106 and developer contributions and council prudential borrowing if required. The scheme will upgrade the pedestrian footbridge between Telford Central Station

and Telford Town Centre and upgrade Rampart Way and Hall Park Way to include dualling sections of the road to alleviate pressure on the Box Road.

As notification of this successful bid was received after the Council agreed the budget for 2015/16, approval is sought to amend the Capital Programme to include this project and funding as profiled below:

<b>Telford Town Centre Connectivity Package</b>				
	2015/16 £'000	2016/17 £'000	2017/18 £'000	Total £'000
Expenditure	157	2,303	9,843	12,303
Funding: DfT Grant		(2,067)	(8,268)	(10,335)
Funding: T&W	(157)	(236)	(1,575)	(1,968)

#### 9.0 **PREVIOUS MINUTES**

27/2/14 – Council, Service & Financial Planning Strategy  
 26/6/14 - Cabinet, Service & Financial Planning Report – 2013/14  
 Outturn and 2014/15 Update  
 24/7/14 – Cabinet, 2014/15 Financial Monitoring Report  
 11/9/14 – Council, 2014/15 Financial Monitoring Report  
 16/10/14 – Cabinet, 2014/15 Financial Monitoring Report  
 27/11/14 – Council, 2014/15 Financial Monitoring Report  
 08/01/15 – Cabinet, 2014/15 Financial Monitoring Report  
 22/01/15 – Council, 2014/15 Financial Monitoring Report  
 26/02/15 – Cabinet, 2014/15 Financial Monitoring Report

#### 10.0 **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

2014/15 Budget Strategy and Financial Ledger reports  
 2015/16 Budget Strategy

Report Prepared by:

Ken Clarke, Assistant Director: Finance, Audit & Information  
 Governance – 01952 383100;

Pauline Harris, Corporate Finance Manager – 01952 383701

## Summary of 2014/15 Outturn Variations

Service Area	Approved Budget	Outturn	Variance	Analysis of Variance						
				Asset Rentals	IAS19	Public Health	Service	One Off Savs	Ongoing Savs	Pressures
				£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Children's Safeguarding & Specialist Services	20,498,422	<b>21,697,262</b>	1,198,840	230	61,000	0	1,217,610	(30,000)	(50,000)	0
Education & Corporate Parenting	10,884,147	<b>11,403,743</b>	519,596	1,335,674	32,000	(311,986)	(406,092)	(130,000)	0	0
Family, Cohesion & Commissioning Services	9,713,047	<b>8,808,046</b>	(905,001)	(45,097)	70,000	(32,227)	11,323	(751,000)	(158,000)	0
Development, Business & Employment	2,369,583	<b>1,891,640</b>	(477,943)	(10,946)	58,000	(56,943)	(28,171)	(344,754)	(95,129)	0
Neighbourhood & Leisure Services	30,643,265	<b>30,173,408</b>	(469,857)	(9,282)	64,000	(137,600)	(201,975)	(170,000)	(15,000)	0
Adult Social Services	37,528,318	<b>38,196,188</b>	667,870	0	50,000	460	617,410	0	0	0
Public Health, Well Being & Public Protection	2,005,078	<b>1,601,157</b>	(403,921)	0	15,000	0	(218,921)	(200,000)	0	0
Customer Services	4,764,596	<b>4,113,644</b>	(650,952)	(1,323)	118,000	0	(511,704)	(160,000)	(350,925)	255,000
Law, Democracy & People Services	2,329,380	<b>253,026</b>	(2,076,354)	1,176	28,000	0	(188,880)	(1,513,000)	(403,650)	0
Finance, Audit & Information Governance	9,615,330	<b>7,249,830</b>	(2,365,500)	0	32,000	0	(934,401)	(1,150,000)	(313,100)	0
Cooperative Council Delivery Unit	1,327,580	<b>1,207,668</b>	(119,912)	0	24,000	(43,131)	(13,851)	0	(86,930)	0
Council Wide (including Asset Rentals)	(2,444,216)	<b>(4,006,398)</b>	(1,562,182)	(1,270,432)	(552,000)	0	(197,176)	0	457,426	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>129,234,530</b>	<b>122,589,214</b>	<b>(6,645,316)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(581,427)</b>	<b>(854,828)</b>	<b>(4,448,754)</b>	<b>(1,015,308)</b>	<b>255,000</b>

Proposed Transfers to Reserves			
Capacity/Invest to Save Fund		1,000,000	1,000,000
Severance Fund		2,200,000	2,200,000
Pride in Your Community Fund 17/18		1,000,000	1,000,000
Parish Environmental Teams (17/18 and 18/19)		800,000	800,000
Unemployment Initiatives		500,000	500,000

**Total Variance after Transfers**      **129,234,530**      **128,089,214**      **(1,145,316)**

Required as part of 2015/16 Budget Strategy      858,000

**Residual Balance**      **(287,316)**

2014/15 Revenue Budget Variations over £50,000												
Description	Budget	Outturn	Variation	Analysis of Variation							Comments	
				Asset Rent	IAS19	Public Health	Service	One Off Savs	Ongoing Savs	Pressures		
	£	£	£	£	£		£	£	£	£		
<b>Childrens Safeguarding &amp; Specialist Services</b>												
Children in Care Placements	8,480,833	10,038,793	1,557,960				1,557,960					The 2013/14 reported outturn position was £2.089m overspent. The budget strategy included a budget reduction of £1.200m for CiC Placements. A cost reduction of £0.680m was achieved against a Cost Improvement target of £0.870m across External Fostering and Residential. The number of Children in Care at 31st March 2015 : 293 compared to 31st March 2014 : 309. The CiC Placements budget for 2015/16 includes savings of £0.300m. There is a target cost reduction for Children in Care Placements in the draft Cost Improvement Plan for 2015/16.
Care leavers Accommodation costs	599,630	765,623	165,993				165,993					The 2013/14 reported outturn position was £0.344m.overspent and a cost reduction of £0.178m was achieved against a target of £0.160m. The draft Cost Improvement Plan for 2015/16 has a target to continue progress in reducing costs for Care leaver placements..
Staffing (Safeguarding)	4,899,383	5,174,352	274,969		38,000		236,969					The Cost Improvement Plan included a target to reduce the number of Agency Social Workers to 2 by the end of 2014/15 . The number of Agency staff in Children in Care/Leaving Care service has reduced to zero as planned. The actual number of Agency staff at 31st March 2015 was 10. Three of these are staff added from January to cover critical capacity gap due to demand to support a short term recovery plan in the last 4 months of the financial year. The 2014/15 outturn included £0.819m cost of Agency staff compared to £0.465m in 2013/14. Vacancies held in year within the Safeguarding service have resulted in partly offsetting Agency costs.
Staffing (Specialist Services)	2,494,394	2,401,149	(93,245)		23,000		(116,245)					This underspend relates to a number of vacancies across Childrens Specialist services. It includes a loss of income of £0.083m for joint arrangement services with Shropshire Council where Telford and Wrekin Council are the host authority.
Internal Foster Carers costs	327,742	491,461	163,719				163,719					Overspend arises from Foster Carers transport of £0.096m and other related support budgets for Internal Foster carers which is partly related to switch from use of external foster carers.
Joint Adoption Service	328,725	408,019	79,294				79,294					The 2014/15 budget for the service hosted by Shropshire was reduced by £0.040m and it has not been possible to deliver these savings. Remaining overspend relates to new partnership working with Voluntary Adoption Agencies for out of area placements which is planned to deliver future cost reduction on Children in Care placements. Work will continue in 2015/16 to develop proposals to bring spend back within budget for all Adoption services.
Direct Payments	185,428	290,619	105,191				105,191					This budget is for direct payment personal care for Children with disabilities. A review of this budget is in progress as a result of Special Educational Needs reforms to be introduced in 2015/16.
Children not in Care / in Need costs		190,427	190,427				190,427					This overspend has arisen from both Adoption Fees costs of £0.087m and Section 17 payments of £0.103m. Adoption fees are one-off costs paid to third parties to help place children with families therefore avoiding high cost children in care placements. Section 17 costs are payments made to carers of children in need to support them at home and therefore avoid higher care related costs.
Corporate Contingency		(1,200,000)	(1,200,000)				(1,200,000)					Set aside as a specific draw-down budget for Childrens Safeguarding and Specialist Services.
Drawdown of Reserves		(78,000)	(78,000)				(78,000)					One off use of reserve held in Childrens Safeguarding and Specialist Services
Variations under £50k	3,182,287	3,214,818	32,531	230			112,301	(30,000)	(50,000)			
<b>Total Children's Safeguarding</b>	<b>20,498,422</b>	<b>21,697,262</b>	<b>1,198,840</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>61,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,217,610</b>	<b>(30,000)</b>	<b>(50,000)</b>	<b>0</b>		
<b>Education &amp; Corporate Parenting</b>												
Miscellaneous Secondary School Expenditure	3,214,789	3,780,791	566,002	508,705	32,000		(32,000)	57,297				Increase in asset rentals as all maintained schools apart from those that are voluntary aided now included on the local authority's balance sheet. Service variation is a result of redundancy costs at secondary schools, arising from staffing changes in response to falling pupil numbers, resulting in higher costs than budgeted
Miscellaneous Primary School Expenditure	3,370,808	4,179,410	808,602	826,969			(18,367)					Increase in asset rentals as all maintained schools apart from those that are voluntary aided now included on the local authority's balance sheet
Education Service Grant (ESG)	(2,680,000)	(2,785,247)	(105,247)				(105,247)					ESG is primarily determined by the number of pupils in schools, particularly maintained schools, for which a much higher amount of ESG per pupil is paid to local authorities compared to academies. The budget for 2014-15 had anticipated a number of in-year academy conversions, which would have reduced local authority ESG, but none actually occurred. A number of conversions have been postponed until 2015-16 the impact of which has been reflected in the budget. It should be noted that due to the proposed change in government policy to accelerate academy conversion to Requires Improvement Schools in addition to those judged inadequate it is highly likely that there will be a further reduction in this funding next year and beyond.

2014/15 Revenue Budget Variations over £50,000												
Description	Budget	Outturn	Variation	Analysis of Variation						Comments		
				Asset Rent	IAS19	Public Health	Service	One Off Savs	Ongoing Savs		Pressures	
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	
School Improvement	254,421	8,460	(245,961)				(245,961)					The underspend arose from a combination of lower costs due to in-year vacancies combined with additional trading income following a restructure which created more traded posts. The budget for this area is shown as the sum of three cost centres, School Improvement Advisors, Traded Advisory Service and Secondary Advisory Service.
Misc management	23,218	(115,546)	(138,764)				(8,764)	(130,000)				Rationalisation of Education Funding
Early Years & Childcare	399,063	340,651	(58,412)				(58,412)					Variation mainly a result of lower than budgeted expenditure on non staffing costs.
Public Health Grant		(311,986)	(311,986)			(311,986)						Additional Public Health grant received to support the early years team to promote school readiness.
Transport	2,715,108	2,649,506	(65,602)				(65,602)					Lower fleet and non fleet charges compared to budget led to an underspend not expected to be repeated in 2015-16, in the context of increased transport costs for the new Holy Trinity Academy school and a reduction in Extended Rights to Free Travel grant support from the Government.
Variations under £50,000	3,586,740	3,657,703	70,963				70,963					
<b>Total Education &amp; Corporate Parenting</b>	<b>10,884,147</b>	<b>11,403,743</b>	<b>519,596</b>	<b>1,335,674</b>	<b>32,000</b>	<b>(311,986)</b>	<b>(406,092)</b>	<b>(130,000)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Family, Cohesion &amp; Commissioning Services</b>												
Transport	421,444	396,787	(24,657)	1,970	10,000		(36,627)	0	0	0	0	0 The saving identified here relates to staffing savings accruing this year following restructure. The current financial forecasts for Adult's and Children's Services and Public Transport are reported separately
Cohesion	2,472,907	2,153,028	(319,879)	0	18,000	(32,227)	(205,652)	(100,000)	0	0	0	0 The Cohesions service has continued to monitor spending carefully up to the year end and has maintained an improved performance against budget in Housing services particularly improving the income generated against target. There is a significant proportion of the underspend resulting from temporary vacancies arising from the lead time to recruit to the new structure introduced in year. Additional Public Health funding has been allocated in year.
Youth Offending Service	380,900	215,348	(165,552)	318	5,000		(34,870)	(136,000)	0	0	0	0 The Council contributes to the Regional Youth Offending Service, and the 2013/14 outturn for that service reported a surplus of income over expenditure. The surplus is being returned to the funding partners in accordance with the level of contribution made in year. Therefore, a one off sum of £107k was returned to the Council this year and this was unbudgeted. The 2014/15 contribution from funding authorities is also reduced resulting in further cost reductions to this service in year of £41k.
Early Intervention & Family Connect	3,549,490	3,249,577	(299,913)	(47,385)	24,000		(528)	(176,000)	(100,000)	0	0	0 Maintaining spending at 2013/14 levels in Children and Family Locality Centres and restructure savings in Early Intervention have resulted in an underspend which is partly offset by staffing pressures in Family Connect.
Contracting & Commissioning	2,737,307	2,852,463	115,156	0	12,000		303,156	(147,000)	(53,000)	0	0	0 There is a significant underspend which has resulted from the Contracting and Commissioning restructure including a saving for CAMHS. Much of this saving was reported as one off as it resulted from the lead in time required to populate the new structure. In addition there are some savings from a change in existing SLAs. These savings are offset by pressures resulting from the movement of Supporting People from Adult Social Services which has overspent by £384k. This pressure is identified and being managed in the Adult Social Services Cost Improvement Plan.
Variations under £50,000	0	(192,000)	(192,000)	0	0		0	(192,000)	0	0	0	0 Rationalisation of funding streams available to the service
	150,999	132,843	(18,156)	0	1,000		(14,156)	0	(5,000)	0	0	
<b>Total Family, Cohesion &amp; Commissioning Services</b>	<b>9,713,047</b>	<b>8,808,046</b>	<b>(905,001)</b>	<b>(45,097)</b>	<b>70,000</b>	<b>(32,227)</b>	<b>11,323</b>	<b>(751,000)</b>	<b>(158,000)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

2014/15 Revenue Budget Variations over £50,000											
Description	Budget	Outturn	Variation	Analysis of Variation						Comments	
				Asset Rent	IAS19	Public Health	Service	One Off Savs	Ongoing Savs		Pressures
	£	£	£	£	£		£	£	£	£	
<b>Adult Social Services</b>											
Purchasing of Care - all client groups	39,714,056	45,286,952	5,572,896				5,572,896				This final reported position for the delivery of Care to vulnerable adults reveals the continuing pressure on the Adult Social Services budget. The pressure reported includes an adjustment for the costs of care incurred which are being met by a deferred payment agreement. To account properly for these in the final accounts, the gross costs of these agreements is included in purchasing with an equal and opposite adjustment increasing income. The adjustment being £807k. With this adjustment taken out pressure on the budget has actually reduced from that last reported by around £0.48m. This is mainly because there are reduced costs of care arising from the costs of respite care around £190k, homecare and residential care reductions around £200k. The financial performance against budget will remain an area of close scrutiny and management as 2015/16 progresses. The continuing improvements being worked on to deliver reduced costs from improved efficiency, procurement of services and transforming services will continue apace, whilst demands from the emerging requirements of the Care Act begin to take effect.
Transport	651,746	830,793	179,047				179,047				The 14/15 ASS transport budget was reduced by £229k as a result of the recommendations made in the Transport Review. The pressure on this budget has been reduced over the year to date. A Transport Review Project Group has been set up to look at ways to reduce Adult Social Services expenditure on Transport and identify a more robust transport policy in a bid to address any overspend arising in 2015/16.
Employees	6,074,099	5,820,293	(253,806)		50,000		(303,806)				This underspend has resulted from vacancies and extended lead times in recruitment to posts etc. This underspend includes a part year impact of the phase 1 restructure
Capital Financing	75,214	75,214	0								
Public Health	(53,267)	(53,267)	0								
Income	(17,634,684)	(19,377,549)	(1,742,865)				(1,742,865)				This variation reflects the revised treatment of deferred payment agreement in the accounts as well as realised additional income received in year. The income from deferred payments offsetting costs of purchasing above are £807k. The actual additional income (over budget) in year results from; Income from Government to support work on handling Winter pressures and reducing the delay to people leaving hospital £526k, Government grant funding received to support implementation of the Care Act 2014 £101k, £250k income received over the target estimate for the year.
Variations under £50,000	8,701,154	8,753,752	52,598			460	52,138				
Transfer from ASS Reserve		(900,000)	(900,000)				(900,000)				Use of One Off reserves held within Adult Social Services
Transfer from Corporate Reserve		(2,240,000)	(2,240,000)				(2,240,000)				Set aside as a specific draw-down budget for Adult Social Services
<b>Total Adult Social Services</b>	<b>37,528,318</b>	<b>38,196,188</b>	<b>667,870</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>617,410</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Public Health, Wellbeing &amp; Public Protection</b>											
<b>Public Health</b>											
Staffing and operational budgets	1,093,953	883,526	(210,427)		1,000		(102,019)	(109,408)			A one-off underspend of £0.092m has arisen both from vacancies in year and staff not at top of scale. These posts have now been filled and the delivery of the one-off savings from 2015/16 onwards will be met through the Substance Misuse service (see below). Additional one-off underspends have arisen from operational budgets.
Smoking Cessation Contract	603,600	372,189	(231,411)				(231,411)				The underspend relates to both the reduced numbers of people quitting smoking and the popularity of E-cigarettes. Any introduction of regulation of E-cigarettes could result in a subsequent increase of costs in 2015/16.
Substance Misuse	2,745,942	2,494,098	(251,844)				(251,844)				The 2015/16 planned saving of £0.200m from the Substance Misuse service have been realised during 2014/15 with DARS and inpatient detox in particular contributing to this underspend.
NHS Health Checks	202,500	116,738	(85,762)				(85,762)				The underspend relates to a lower numbers of Health checks carried out by the third party contracted to deliver this service. Work will continue with the provider in 2015/16 to increase numbers taking up Health Checks across the borough.
Variations under £50,000	2,989,816	2,891,795	(98,021)				(23,429)	(74,592)			The delivery of these one-off savings from 2015/16 onwards will be met through the Substance Misuse service (see above).
Grant	(7,435,811)	(6,854,384)	581,427				581,427				Additional Public Health Grant allocated to Services re. Public Health outcomes
Carry Forward		97,038	97,038				97,038				Agreed carry forward
<b>Public Protection &amp; Civil Resilience</b>											
Staffing - Public Protection	1,419,680	1,272,929	(146,751)		14,000		(144,751)	(16,000)			The delivery of 2015/16 savings of £0.051m has been realised early in 2014/15. Underspend has arisen from vacancies held in year across Environmental Health and Business Support.
Coroners Court	293,950	262,360	(31,590)				(31,590)				This one-off underspend reflects the costs relating to inquests completed in 2014/15. The service is run by Shropshire Council on behalf of Telford & Wrekin Council.
Variations under £50,000	91,448	64,868	(26,580)				(26,580)				
<b>Total Public Health, Wellbeing &amp; Public Protection</b>	<b>2,005,078</b>	<b>1,601,157</b>	<b>(403,921)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(218,921)</b>	<b>(200,000)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

2014/15 Revenue Budget Variations over £50,000												
Description		Budget £	Outturn £	Variation £	Analysis of Variation						Comments	
					Asset Rent £	IAS19 £	Public Health	Service £	One Off Savs £	Ongoing Savs £		Pressures £
<b>Neighbourhood &amp; Leisure Services</b>												
<u>Highways &amp; Neighbourhood Management</u>												
Footpath Lighting Wrekin - Special Fund	Premises Related	601,320	514,022	(87,298)				(87,298)				Street lighting energy savings (£25k) and reduced R&M costs (£62k).
Street lighting - General fund	Premises Related	1,046,330	983,973	(62,357)				(62,357)				Street lighting energy savings (£61k) .
Highways Insurance Excess	Supplies & Services	84,870	30,738	(54,132)				(54,132)				Reduction in year of insurance Claim payments, robust inspection regime enables ability to defend claims.
Recharges - Accidental Damage	Income	(23,200)	(88,086)	(64,886)				(64,886)				More robust process in collecting driver data from traffic Highway damage incidents resulting in improved ability to recharge insurance companies.
Highways & Engineering	Employees	971,750	1,180,330	208,580		9,000		199,580				£114k relates to VR costs, offset by contributions on income below. £78k in year pressures arising from re-structure offset by contributions from Capital grants.
	Income	(1,869,000)	(2,175,671)	(306,671)				(306,671)				(£114k) contribution to VR costs above. Additional income from maximised use of Capital grants.
Environmental Maintenance	Supplies & Services	162,364	56,394	(105,970)				(970)	(105,000)			(£154k) One off restructure savings held against this budget to provide funding for Contract Management system, now shown as a released saving to overall underspends to fund Bid submitted and agreed at S&FP.
Sports/Grounds	Third Party Payments	46,570	(11,207)	(57,777)				(57,777)				(21k) One off saving from refund relating to previous financial year for bedding plants.
Drain Clearing	Premises Related	81,860	31,211	(50,649)				(50,649)				Underspend used to fund Primary routes Gully emptying below.
	Third Party Payments	0	141,922	141,922				141,922				Additional costs of Gully emptying on Primary routes, offsets partially with underspends above.
Drainage	Premises Related	90,350	38,300	(52,050)				(52,050)				Underspend used to fund additional works on 'Hotspots' below.
	Supplies & Services	0	54,761	54,761				54,761				Additional work completed on 'Hotspots' to alleviate issues ongoing, funded from underspends on Barriers and underspend above.
	Third Party Payments	0	95,811	95,811				95,811				Additional work completed on 'Hotspots' to alleviate issues ongoing, funded from underspends on Barriers.
Flood Barriers	Supplies & Services	97,000	8,651	(88,349)				(88,349)				No requirement to deploy flood barriers, underspends utilised to fund Drainage and clearing above.
Winter Maintenance	Supplies & Services	0	131,988	131,988				131,988				Relates to the purchase of Salt stocks, budget held on Third Party Payments, budgets below, realigned in 15/16.
	Third Party Payments	581,010	495,640	(85,370)				(85,370)				The net overspend (including Supplies & Services above) relates to 13/14 invoices received in year as a result of the Footway Bridges policy review completed prior to 14/15.
	Variations under £50,000	10,139,511	10,146,763	7,252	193	4,000		3,059				
<u>Transport &amp; Highway Development</u>												
Concessionary Travel	Transport Related	58,770	2,167	(56,603)				(56,603)				Expenditure incurred within Supplies & Services below. Budgets realigned in 15/16.
	Supplies & Services	1,758,824	1,632,833	(125,991)				(125,991)				Savings as a result of reducing passenger numbers. Review of Budgets identified cumulative Inflation for Public Transport included here, realigned in 15/16.
Public Transport	Transport Related	307,181	391,379	84,198				84,198				Further realignment of budgets required in 15/16 from Concessionary Travel..
	Supplies & Services	12,225	97,000	84,775				84,775				Savings of £50k achieved comparing actual spend to 13/14. Further realignment of budgets required in 15/16.
	Transport Related	0	97,000	97,000				97,000				£97k transferred to Transport reserve account to support one off pressure in 15/16 for Subsidised Routes, as agreed at Strategic & Financial Planning.
Highways & Transport Strategic Policy	Employees	819,240	584,574	(234,666)		5,000		(224,666)		(15,000)		(£85k) savings arising from vacancy management prior to restructure. Additional savings arising from the movement of LSTF funded posts offsets against reduced income below of £54k. (£85k) savings identified within income target set below but delivered on salary savings due to vacancy management. Ongoing savings given up in 15/16 of £25k.
	Income	(1,388,600)	(1,219,801)	168,799				168,799				£85k income target offsets against savings above. £54k reduced LSTF funding offset with salary savings above.
Off Street Car parking	Premises Related	230,960	153,467	(77,493)				(77,493)				One off saving as a result of maximising capital funding for Ironbridge Park & Ride.
Highways Development Structures & Geotechnics	Employees	341,990	269,678	(72,312)		2,000		(74,312)				One off savings as a result of vacancy management.
	Employees	376,189	307,867	(68,322)		3,000		(71,322)				One off savings due to difficulties recruiting into 3 vacant Engineer posts.
	Variations under £50,000	803,857	882,418	78,561	3,535		(9,601)	84,627				
<u>Waste and Neighbourhood Services</u>												
Operational Waste Team	Employees	310,928	361,355	50,427		2,000		63,427	(15,000)			A number of VR's in year, offset with income contribution below. One off savings from service redesign, with ongoing savings to be delivered in 15/16.
	Income	(597,860)	(667,547)	(69,687)				(69,687)				Contributions to VR's in year, offsets with expenditure above.

2014/15 Revenue Budget Variations over £50,000												
Description		Budget £	Outturn £	Variation £	Analysis of Variation						Comments	
					Asset Rent £	IAS19 £	Public Health	Service £	One Off Savs £	Ongoing Savs £		Pressures £
	Variations under £50,000	10,677,741	10,699,081	21,340		5,000		66,340	(50,000)			Pressures around Demography and inert Waste, growth £46k given in 15/16. One off saving from Green waste disposal in relation to backdated refund for gate fees.
<u>Leisure Facilities &amp; Services</u>												
Horsehay Golf Course	Income	(239,410)	(169,317)	70,093		1,000		69,093				There has been a national downturn in Golf participation which has impacted on this income shortfall in addition to competition from other courses competing for the 'pay & play' market.
Oakengates Leisure	Income	(1,035,060)	(925,924)	109,136		3,000		106,136				Impact on income as a result of the construction of new school and subsequent closure of Leisure facilities during key building works and to allow for refurbishment of the Leisure Centre.
Wellington Swimming Pool	Income	(221,910)	(307,947)	(86,037)		3,000	(68,355)	(20,682)				Additional Public Health funding for Aspirations Physical Activity consultants, plus additional income arising from Public swimming.
Leisure Management Account	Income	(753,770)	(834,384)	(80,614)		2,000	(54,903)	(27,711)				Additional Public Health funding for Leisure Concessions scheme.
Arthog	Supplies & Services	227,120	316,877	89,757				89,757				Increased cost associated with increased visitor numbers. Expenditure more than offset by additional income generated.
	Income	(894,760)	(1,032,936)	(138,176)				(138,176)				Increased number of school visits and increased occupancy from non-school groups outside of school term time. As a result of the positive impact on income, £45k has been transferred to Arthog Reserve Account to support future development.
Leisure Facilities & Services	Variations under £50,000	6,429,352	6,548,232	118,880	(13,010)	14,000	527	117,363				Remaining variances relate to a number of sites including Stirchley, Phoenix and Landscape.
<u>Arts &amp; Culture</u>												
Oakengates Theatre	Income	(331,460)	(431,951)	(100,491)				(100,491)				Successful impact of Pantomime and other Theatre productions in year.
	Supplies & Services	108,840	139,429	30,589				30,589				Increased costs associated with the overachievement of income above.
	Variations under £50,000	881,630	917,235	35,605		8,000	(5,268)	32,873				
Neighbourhood & Leisure Services	Variations under £50,000	750,513	727,083	(23,430)		3,000		(26,430)				
<b>Total Neighbourhood &amp; Leisure Services</b>		<b>30,643,265</b>	<b>30,173,408</b>	<b>(469,857)</b>	<b>(9,282)</b>	<b>64,000</b>	<b>(137,600)</b>	<b>(201,975)</b>	<b>(170,000)</b>	<b>(15,000)</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Development, Business &amp; Employment</b>												
<u>Skills Delivery, Lifelong Learning, Careers &amp; Youth Employment</u>												
Connexions for Youth	Income	(228,218)	(286,215)	(57,997)			(20,322)	(37,675)				Release of 13/14 accrual no longer required in relation to Cognisoft software system. This system has now been installed to facilitate better analysis of unemployment data in accordance with the pledges within the Youth Unemployment Programme.
	Transport Related Expenditure	72,030	36,029	(36,001)				3,999		(40,000)		
Post 16 Transport	Transport Related Expenditure	226,534	163,914	(62,620)				11,301	(73,921)			Post 16 Transport savings delivered.
	Income	(72,500)	(12,500)	60,000				60,000				Contributions towards Post 16 transport not received from TCAT & New College which will create an ongoing pressure. Level of service undergoing review and subject to audit in 2015/16.
Turnaround Programme new 2014	Third Party Payments	-	118,900	118,900				118,900				New scheme commenced in 2014 and grants confirmed late in year, income below
	Income	(140,620)	(229,350)	(88,730)				(88,730)				Funding from ESF administered by Worcester County Council for Turnaround. New scheme commenced in 2014 and grants confirmed later in year, offsets with expenditure above.
Tacking Youth Unemployment	Employees	449,370	376,168	(73,202)		2,000		(75,202)				Delay in recruiting to a number of temporary posts part way through the year, offsets with transfer of underspends to reserve account below.
	Income	164,490	224,783	60,293				60,293				Transfer of underspends due to timing of staff appointments to temporary posts.
	Variations under £50,000	1,391,506	1,344,580	(46,926)		12,000	13,379	(72,305)				
Development Management												
Planning Applications	Supplies & Services	5,830	67,634	61,804		2,000		59,804				LPA costs relating to planning appeals.

2014/15 Revenue Budget Variations over £50,000												
Description		Budget £	Outturn £	Variation £	Analysis of Variation						Comments	
					Asset Rent £	IAS19 £	Public Health	Service £	One Off Savs £	Ongoing Savs £		Pressures £
Planning Business Management Account	Income	(1,156,510)	(1,434,138)	(277,628)				(217,628)	(60,000)			One off benefit from increased planning fees as a result of a buoyant housing market, inward investment and business expansions. Vacancy Management, one off.
	Employees	1,339,980	1,268,355	(71,625)		10,000		(81,625)				
	Variations under £50,000	726,730	718,931	(7,799)				(7,799)				
Business & Development Planning Environment & Planning Policy	Employees	532,050	413,312	(118,738)		4,000		(122,738)				In year vacancy savings with all posts now filled, 15/16 budgets realigned.
	Supplies & Services	74,310	141,316	67,006				67,006				Shaping Places site consultation document produced.
Business Support	Supplies & Services	45,500	133,160	87,660				87,660				£58k Business Support grant applied to businesses affected by flooding, offset by (£58k) Business Support grant applied, expenditure incurred above.
	Income	-	(95,448)	(95,448)				(95,448)				
Management Account	Employees	496,760	356,997	(139,763)		3,000		803	(133,566)	(10,000)		Service redesign implemented resulting in ongoing savings.
	Income	(1,750)	(26,859)	(25,109)				(109)	(25,000)			Applied Green Deal funding.
	Variations under £50,000	2,393,946	2,204,311	(189,635)	13,010	7,000	(50,000)	(109,645)	(50,000)			Applied Green Deal funding.
Property & Design Engineering, Architect & Building	Employees	1,520,000	1,404,309	(115,691)		10,000		(125,691)				Vacancy Management - one off savings.
	Supplies & Services	197,190	82,952	(114,238)				(114,238)				Reduced spend on consultancy services - workload increasingly managed in Additional grant funded schemes including Lodge Road.
	Income	(2,488,410)	(2,563,421)	(75,011)				(75,011)				
Operational Properties & Admin Buildings	Premises related	6,035,590	6,209,336	173,746	(41,814)			215,560				Pressures from additional R&M, Utility & NNDR costs in year. Heating failures at Wellington Civic during the winter months, now resolved. £44k Ongoing pressure at Abraham Darby due to the hire of generator to support ICT servers incase of power failure. Bus station cleaning had not been charged by TWS for a number of years and invoice for £30k was paid.
	Variations under £50,000	(5,209,266)	(5,262,211)	(52,945)				(53,945)				
Regeneration & Investment PIP & Service Charges Southwater Car Park	PIP & Service Charge net variance	(4,219,950)	(3,930,853)	289,097	17,858			271,239				Ongoing rationalisation of PIP resulting in an in year pressure on income and Delays to the opening date and road work disruption have impacted on the usage of the car park. Business is rapidly growing as a result of the Southwater development with a range of restaurants and facilities now open. Projection improves in 15/16.
	Southwater Car park net variance	(308,000)	(3,961)	304,039				304,039				
Regeneration & Investment Management Account	Employees	658,590	485,759	(172,831)		5,000		(146,925)	(2,267)	(28,639)		Additional one off savings from Vacancy Management. Ongoing savings from VR.
	Income	(346,860)	(248,572)	98,288				98,288				Unachievable historic income target relating to asset disposals, realigned in 15/16.
	Variations under £50,000	211,331	224,485	13,154				29,644		(16,490)		
Development, Business & Employment	Variations under £50,000	(70)	9,937	10,007		2,000		8,007				
<b>Total Development, Business &amp; Employment</b>		<b>2,369,583</b>	<b>1,891,640</b>	<b>(477,943)</b>	<b>(10,946)</b>	<b>58,000</b>	<b>(56,943)</b>	<b>(28,171)</b>	<b>(344,754)</b>	<b>(95,129)</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Customer Services</b>												
Care & Enablement	Various	(320)	170,057	170,377		32,000		(251,017)	(50,000)	184,395	255,000	Reprofiling of the Care & Enablement Savings Between 2014/15 and 2015/16 with £184k of the overall saving being met from additional Business Rates income. This includes the £260 drawdown of one off funds.
ICT	Various	276	129,776	129,500	(1,323)	27,000		(134,177)		238,000		Additional savings realised from the restructure of ICT, a number of posts have not yet been appointed to. This position includes the reallocation of ICT savings proposals totalling £238k which will be met from alternative savings achieved through increased Council Tax and Business Rates income.
Revenues & Benefits	Income	(390,570)	(501,345)	(110,775)				(10,775)		(100,000)		Additional income generated from Court Fees as a result of increased taxpayers being taken to Court.
Revenues & Benefits	Supplies & Services		(30,000)	(30,000)					(30,000)			Under spend arising from the cost of Bailiffs projected in line with 2013/14. This contract will be reproced in the next 12 months.
Cleaning	Various	445,756	333,768	(111,988)		10,000		(101,988)		(20,000)		Mainly additional income being achieved from Facilities Management & Cleaning. Also underspends arising from staff not being appointed to top of scale.
Cleaning	Carbon Reduction Commitment		(41,923)	(41,923)				1,077	(43,000)			One off benefit from the final year of the Carbon Reduction Commitment scheme in 2013/14.
Cleaning	PFI Insurance	(60,000)	(97,000)	(37,000)					(37,000)			One off benefit from reduced insurance costs linked to the PFI contract.

2014/15 Revenue Budget Variations over £50,000												
Description		Budget £	Outturn £	Variation £	Analysis of Variation						Comments	
					Asset Rent £	IAS19 £	Public Health	Service £	One Off Savs £	Ongoing Savs £		Pressures £
Cemeteries	Income	(167,600)	(235,309)	(67,709)				(67,709)				Additional income generated from burials. Increased Council Tax and Business Rates income has been achieved however due to accounting regulations this is not available to the Council in 2014/15 and will be met from one off funds until 2015/16
One off Funding			(600,000)	(600,000)						(600,000)		
Variations under £50,000		4,937,054	4,985,620	48,566		49,000		52,885		(53,320)		
<b>Total Customer Services</b>		<b>4,764,596</b>	<b>4,113,644</b>	<b>(650,952)</b>	<b>(1,323)</b>	<b>118,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(511,704)</b>	<b>(160,000)</b>	<b>(350,925)</b>	<b>255,000</b>	
<b>Finance, Audit &amp; Information Governance</b>												
Treasury Management		9,615,330	7,466,197	(2,149,133)				(757,133)	(1,150,000)	(242,000)		Active treasury management including the benefit from extending the change in the calculation of Minimum Revenue Provision applied to prudential borrowing in 2013/14 to include supported debt (government allocations). It is also net of the impact of deferred capital receipts.
Variations under £50,000			(216,367)	(216,367)		32,000		(177,268)		(71,100)		
<b>Total Finance, Audit &amp; Information Governance</b>		<b>9,615,330</b>	<b>7,249,830</b>	<b>(2,365,500)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>32,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(934,401)</b>	<b>(1,150,000)</b>	<b>(313,100)</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Law, Democracy &amp; People Services</b>												
Single Status	Employees	1,950,000	0	(1,950,000)					(1,500,000)	(450,000)		
Variations under £50,000		379,380	253,026	(126,354)	1,176	28,000		(188,880)	(13,000)	46,350		
<b>Total Law, Democracy &amp; People Services</b>		<b>2,329,380</b>	<b>253,026</b>	<b>(2,076,354)</b>	<b>1,176</b>	<b>28,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(188,880)</b>	<b>(1,513,000)</b>	<b>(403,650)</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Cooperative Delivery Unit</b>												
Delivery & Planning	Employees	742,520	647,715	(94,805)		6,000		(100,805)				Under spend arising from vacant posts in year and posts not at top of grade.
Variations under £50,000		585,060	559,953	(25,107)		18,000	(43,131)	86,954		(86,930)		Includes net income generated from the Solar Farm of £48.9k
<b>Total Cooperative Delivery Unit</b>		<b>1,327,580</b>	<b>1,207,668</b>	<b>(119,912)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>24,000</b>	<b>(43,131)</b>	<b>(13,851)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(86,930)</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Council Wide</b>												
Housing Benefit Subsidy	Various	(143,029)	(353,806)	(210,777)				(210,777)				A reduction in level of overpayments made during the last part of the year has resulted in £124k less Housing Subsidy being lost. Subsidy is only paid for 40% of the eligible overpayments incurred. The provision for debt in relation to overpayments has increased by £564k and the provision for bad debt has increased by £381k. The net impact of these 2 provisions is a benefit of £182k in the accounts. Anticipated one off funds from closure of Transforming Telford now expected in 2015/16. Dividend received from WME over and above budget
One off Funds			600,000	600,000						600,000		
Purchasing Consortium Income	Income	(202,500)	(374,390)	(171,890)				(40,238)		(131,652)		
PFI - HLC Contribution	Supplies & Services	653,390	721,493	68,103				68,103				
Variations under £50,000		4,400,510	4,428,716	28,206				28,206				
Asset Management Account and Other Council Wide Items		(7,152,587)	(9,028,411)	(1,875,824)	(1,270,432)	(552,000)		(42,470)		(10,922)		
<b>Total Council Wide</b>		<b>(2,444,216)</b>	<b>(4,006,398)</b>	<b>(1,562,182)</b>	<b>(1,270,432)</b>	<b>(552,000)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(197,176)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>457,426</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Total Variations</b>		<b>129,234,530</b>	<b>122,589,214</b>	<b>(6,645,316)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(581,427)</b>	<b>(854,828)</b>	<b>(4,448,754)</b>	<b>(1,015,308)</b>	<b>255,000</b>	

0 0

## 2014/15 Revenue Virements for Approval

Virements To:	£	Virements From:	£
<b>Children's Safeguarding &amp; Specialist Services</b>			
Children in Care Placements	1,557,960	Corporate Contingency drawdown	1,200,000
Care Leavers Accommodation Costs	165,993	Staffing (Specialist Services)	116,245
Staffing (Safeguarding)	236,969		
Internal Foster Carer Costs	163,719		
Joint Adoption Service	79,294		
Direct Payments	105,191		
Children not in Care / in need of costs	190,427		
	<b>2,499,553</b>		<b>1,316,245</b>
<b>Education &amp; Corporate Parenting</b>			
Miscellaneous Secondary School Expenditure	57,297	Education Services Grant	105,247
Miscellaneous Secondary School Expenditure - asset rentals	508,705	School Improvement	245,961
Miscellaneous Primary School Expenditure - asset rentals	826,969	Miscellaneous Management	197,176
		Transport	65,602
	<b>1,392,971</b>		<b>613,986</b>
<b>Family, Cohesion Services &amp; Commissioning Services</b>			
Contracting & Commissioning	303,156	Cohesion Services	200,000
		Asset Rentals	47,385
	<b>303,156</b>		<b>247,385</b>
<b>Adult Social Services</b>			
Purchasing of Care - all client groups	5,572,896	Employees	303,806
Transport	179,047	Income	1,742,865
	<b>5,751,943</b>		<b>2,046,671</b>

<u>Virements To:</u>	<u>£</u>	<u>Virements From:</u>	<u>£</u>
<b>Neighbourhood &amp; Leisure Services</b>			
Highways & Engineering - employees	199,580	Street Lighting - premises related	62,357
Drain Clearing - third party payments	141,922	Highways - insurance excesses	54,132
Drainage - supplies and services	54,761	Recharges - accidental damage	64,886
Drainage - third party payments	95,811	Highways & Engineering - income	306,671
Winter Maintenance - supplies and services	131,988	Environmental Maintenance - supplies and services	105,970
Public Transport - Transport Related	181,198	Sports/Grounds - third party payments	57,777
Public Transport - supplies and services	84,775	Concessionary travel - supplies and services	125,991
Highways & Transport Strategic Policy - income	168,799	Highways & Transport Strategic Policy - employees	224,666
Operational Waste Team - employees	63,427	Operational Waste Team - income	69,687
Horsehay Golf Course Income	69,093	Highways Development - employees	74,312
Oakengates Leisure Centre Income	106,136	Structures & Geotechnics - employees	71,322
Arthog - supplies and services	89,757	Off Street Car Parking - premises related	77,493
		Arthog - income	91,983
	<b>1,387,247</b>		<b>1,387,247</b>
<b>Development, Business &amp; Employment</b>			
Post 16 Transport - income	60,000	Post 16 Transport - expenditure	62,620
Turnaround Programme - third party payments	118,900	Turnaround Programme - income	88,730
Tackling Youth unemployment - income	60,293	Tackling Youth unemployment - employees	75,202
Planning Applications - supplies and services	59,804	Planning Applications - income	277,628
Environment & Planning Policy - supplies and services	67,006	Environment & Planning Policy - employees	122,738
Business Support - supplies and services	87,660	Business Support - income	95,448
Operational Properties & Admin Buildings	215,560	Bus. Support Management Account - employees	142,763
PIP & Service Charge net variance	271,239	Bus. Support Management Account - income	25,109
Southwater car park net variance	304,039	Bus. Support Management Account - variations under £50,000	88,378
Regeneration & Investment Management Account - income	98,288	Engineering, Architect & Building - employees	125,691
		Engineering, Architect & Building - supplies and services	114,238
		Engineering, Architect & Building - income	75,011
		Regeneration & Investment Management Account employees	162,720
		Planning Business Management Account - employees	81,625
		Asset Rentals	17,857
	<b>1,342,789</b>		<b>1,555,758</b>
<b>Finance, Audit &amp; Information Governance</b>			
		Treasury Management	2,149,133
		Variations under £50,000	248,368
	<b>0</b>		<b>2,397,501</b>
<b>Public Health, Wellbeing &amp; Public Protection</b>			
Public Health Grant - additional grant allocated to services	581,427		
Public Health - carry forward	97,038		
	<b>678,465</b>		<b>-</b>

<u>Virements To:</u>	<u>£</u>	<u>Virements From:</u>	<u>£</u>
<b>Customer Services</b>			
Care & Enablement - various	439,395	Care & Enablement	301,017
ICT - various	238,000	ICT	134,177
		Revenues & Benefits Income	110,775
		Cleaning - various	121,988
		Revenues & Benefits - supplies and services	9,438
	<u>677,395</u>		<u>677,395</u>
<b>Law, Democracy &amp; People Services</b>			
		Single Status - employees	1,950,000
		Variations under £50,000	155,530
	<u>0</u>		<u>2,105,530</u>

<u>Virements To:</u>	£	<u>Virements From:</u>	£
<b>Cooperative Council Delivery Unit</b>		Delivery & Planning - employees	100,805
	0		100,805
<b>Council Wide</b>			
PFI - HLC Contribution	68,103	Housing Benefit Subsidy	210,777
		Purchasing Consortium income	171,890
		Asset Management Account	1,270,432
	68,103		1,653,099
<b>Total</b>	<b>14,101,622</b>		<b>14,101,622</b>

**Capital - Slippage, Supplementary Estimates & Virements**

Slippage - Scheme	Service Area	Slippage - £	Funding Analysis					
			Prudential	Capital Receipts	External	Govt. Grant	Borrowing	Revenue
Building Schools for the Future	Education & Corporate Parenting	-6,791,767.38	1,195,196.25	-5,030,466.82	36,000.00	-2,992,496.81		
All Other School Schemes	Development Business & Employment	-2,919,333.96	-1,877,759.69	-151,378.15	-354,587.36	-467,821.19	-67,787.57	0.00
Asset Management Plan - General Works & Surveys	Development Business & Employment	-75,639.60	104,360.40	-180,000.00				
Box Road	Neighbourhood & Leisure Services	-709,865.18	-709,865.18					
Housing & NGP Capital	Development Business & Employment	-216,154.89	-216,154.89					
Bond Scheme	Development Business & Employment	-7,454.69	-7,454.69					
Community Fund Grants	Neighbourhood & Leisure Services	154,655.08	154,655.08					
PRIDE - Improvement Fund	Neighbourhood & Leisure Services	-60,341.11	-60,341.11					
PRIDE - Investment in Highways	Neighbourhood & Leisure Services	-325,931.10	-325,931.10					
Travellers Operational Sites	Development Business & Employment	-164,474.29	-164,474.29					
Local Transport Body	Development Business & Employment	-37,012.05				-37,012.05		
LTP - Bridges & structures	Development Business & Employment	56,841.40				56,841.40		
LTP - Highways	Development Business & Employment	-278,811.96				-278,811.96		
		0.00						
Highways Capital - Prudential	Neighbourhood & Leisure Services	-77,976.88	-77,976.88					
Highways Improvement-Business Growth	Neighbourhood & Leisure Services	-119,688.92	-119,688.92					
Highways Improvement-Unadopted Roads	Neighbourhood & Leisure Services	-297,510.48	-297,510.48					
Brookside	Development Business & Employment	-1,041,260.93	-1,041,260.93					
Capital Receipts Site Preparation	Development Business & Employment	-153,683.85		-153,683.85				
Commercial & Business Fund	Co operative Delivery & Commercial Unit	-140,000.00		-140,000.00				
Dawley	Development Business & Employment	-86,059.08		-86,059.08				
Dawley Tennis Courts	Neighbourhood & Leisure Services	-1,006.00			-1,006.00			
Day Opportunities for Adults with Learning Disabilities	Adult Social Services	-891,320.10		-550,000.00		-341,320.10		
Every Day Telford - Pride Hollinswood Centre	Development Business & Employment	-1,339,408.50	-1,339,408.50					
Hadley Local Centre Phase 1 & 2	Development Business & Employment	-138,655.68	51,462.13			-190,117.81		
Horsehay Fitness Facility	Neighbourhood & Leisure Services	-277,128.28	-277,128.28					
Housing	Development Business & Employment	-3,446,384.64	-808,644.10	-150,000.00	-44,937.26	-2,442,803.28		
Housing Company - Housing	Development Business & Employment	-2,963,630.38	-2,963,630.38					
ICT Social Care Review	Adult Social Services	-400,784.54	-350,000.00			-50,784.54		
ICT/ eGov	Customer Services	-603,529.64	-212,608.64			-168,415.00		-222,506.00
Integrated Transport	Neighbourhood & Leisure Services	-777,063.34				-715,149.91	-61,913.43	
Ironbridge Gorge Stability	Neighbourhood & Leisure Services	406,872.97	222,145.97			184,727.00		
Malinslee Local Centre	Development Business & Employment	-28,354.81		-28,354.81				
Managing the funding of the Capital Programme	Corporate	-115,000.00	-8,539,528.68	8,424,528.68				
Parks & Play Areas	Neighbourhood & Leisure Services	-10,789.86	-10,789.86					
Parks for People	Neighbourhood & Leisure Services	-129,891.27	-39,791.52			-90,099.75		
Property Investment Programme	Development Business & Employment	-389,070.41	-389,070.41	0.00				
Social Care Capital Grant	Adult Social Services	-189,118.43				-189,118.43		
Solar farm	Co operative Delivery & Commercial Unit	-27,067.01	-27,067.01					
Street Lighting Energy Programme	Neighbourhood & Leisure Services	52,518.97	52,518.97					
Superfast Broadband Programme	Development Business & Employment	-916,269.77	-159,532.39	-756,737.38				
Sutton Hill	Development Business & Employment	-138,875.85	-138,875.85					
Telford Growth Package	Neighbourhood & Leisure Services	-40,000.00				-40,000.00		
The Place Library and booking office refurbishment	Neighbourhood & Leisure Services	1,420.00	1,420.00					
Town Centre - Accommodation Strategy	Development Business & Employment	-131,157.02	-131,157.02					
Town Centre - Phase 1	Development Business & Employment	-515,519.29		-515,519.29				
Woodside Local Centre & Project Manag.	Development Business & Employment	-46,085.49	-5,986.61	-40,098.88				
	<b>Total</b>	<b>-26,346,768.24</b>	<b>-18,509,878.61</b>	<b>642,230.42</b>	<b>-364,530.62</b>	<b>-7,762,382.43</b>	<b>-129,701.00</b>	<b>-222,506.00</b>



Summary of Section 106 Contributions negotiated through the Planning Process 2014-15			
Service Provision		Value in £'s	Notes
Affordable Housing Cash Value		£909,000	Not including % of affordable housing agreed
Highways Contribution		£1,630,999	
Contribution to Public Transport		£687,000	Includes sums agreed re bus stops/shelters
Travel Plan Monitoring		£36,200	
Air Quality Monitoring		£5,000	
Education Contribution		£9,194,625	
Recreation Contribution		£1,078,000	
Public Open Space Contribution		£313,210	Includes commuted sums for maintenance & new trees
Public Art Contribution		£145,000	
Condition/Financial Monitoring		£136,695	
Contribution to Village Hall		£15,000	Sambrook
Maintenance of local centre		£350,000	To be transferred to mgt company
<b>Total</b>		<b>£14,500,729</b>	

**Note - it should be recognised that there is no guarantee that these sums will come forward because the developments may never get built out**

## **BOROUGH OF TELFORD & WREKIN**

**FULL COUNCIL 9<sup>th</sup> JULY 2015**

### **IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW LEGISLATION AND CHANGES TO CONSTITUTION: DISMISSAL OF STATUTORY OFFICERS**

#### **REPORT OF PEOPLE SERVICES MANAGER, LEGAL SERVICES MANAGER AND AUDIT MANAGER**

## **1.0 PURPOSE**

- 1.1 This report proposes changes to the disciplinary process for, the Head of Paid Service, the Chief Finance Officer and the Monitoring Officer, and is brought forward as a result of recent changes to legislation. The Council are being asked to approve the changes to the Constitution and agree the local arrangements for the Council in respect of the new requirements.
- 1.2 The report also details other minor Constitutional adjustments resulting from the Audit Committee meeting on 30 June 2015

## **2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

2.1 That the Council's Constitution be amended to incorporate the new legislative requirements and that Council consider approving the proposed arrangement as detailed in Appendix 1 for the disciplining and dismissal of senior staff as set out in the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2015 (SI 2015/881), ("the Regulations")

2.2 That the current Independent Persons engaged by the Council for member conduct issues be invited to fulfil the role of Independent Persons under the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2015 (SI 2015/881), ("the Regulations").

2.3 The Council confirm agreement for the arrangements in Appendix1 to contain a panel made up of Independent Persons and that accordingly the requirement for political balance does not apply in accordance with the provisions in section 17 of the Local Government Act 1972.

2.4 That further reports be submitted to Council as national contractual and legislative issues are determined.

2.5 That the Constitutional Changes recommended by Audit Committee at its meeting of 30 June 2015 be approved.

## **3.0 SUMMARY**

- 3.1 This report provides detail of changes required to council processes for the dismissal of Statutory Officers for reasons " other than redundancy permanent ill health or infirmity of mind or body and not including failure to renew a contract for a fixed term unless the authority has undertaken to renew such a contract". A proposal for adopting the statutory requirements is presented to the Council for consideration.

## **4.0 PREVIOUS MINUTES**

4.1 Audit Committee 30 June 2015

## **5.0 INFORMATION**

### **DISMISSAL OF STATUTORY OFFICERS**

5.1 Since 2001 it has been accepted that the Head of Paid Services, the Chief Finance Officer and the Monitoring Officer (“statutory officers”) have statutory functions to discharge that can bring them into conflict with members and accordingly these officers have been given statutory protection requiring that any allegations of misconduct against these officers had to be investigated by a “Designated Independent Person”, (“a DIP”). No disciplinary action could be undertaken other than in accordance with a report from a DIP, generally a barrister with experience of employment law. This was designed to demonstrate independence in the process and counter any allegations of influence from elected members in respect of high level governance issues

5.2 The Government have recently published new regulations on local authorities' disciplinary procedures for removing a statutory senior officer. The Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2015 (SI 2015/881) (“the Regulations”) requires local authorities to amend their Standing Orders to incorporate the new arrangements for taking disciplinary action against statutory officers.

5.3 It is a statutory requirement that these be considered at the first Council meeting following the Annual General Meeting of the Council.

5.4 Changes have been introduced because the government were of the view that the previous process was time consuming and expensive and favoured statutory officers, leading to potentially inflated severance payments being offered in preference to the use of agreed process which was not in the best interests of local taxpayers.

5.5 The intention of the regulations is to localise and simplify the process. In summary, the new proposals remove the previous process involving the DIP. The new constitutional provisions have to establish a process whereby the decision must now be taken by full Council in the light of; advice from a panel which includes Independent Persons, the conclusions of an investigation and representations from the officer concerned.

5.6 The Independent Persons referred to in paragraph 5.5 above have already been appointed to be consulted in respect of the investigation into councillor complaints where there are allegations of a breach of the Members' Code of Conduct. Discussions have taken place with the Council's Independent Persons who have subsequently indicated their willingness to undertake this additional role.

5.7 The requirement for the Council to make changes at its first meeting after the Annual General Meeting means that a number of aspects which will impact upon local implementation remain unresolved because national decisions have not been taken. Some of these relate to contractual aspects which, for these officers, are determined nationally. Further, there is little by way of guidance to accompany the new rules.

5.8 The Regulations set out a process whereby, in the event that disciplinary proceedings are brought against statutory officers, Independent Persons will be invited to form a panel to provide advice, views or recommendations to full Council which must be taken into account before a vote of whether or not to approve a dismissal of a statutory officer is made.

5.9 The Regulations state that a panel must be made up of at least two Independent Persons. The panel will be an advisory committee which is constituted as a formal committee of the Council. The recommendations in Appendix 1 set out a model to allow the rules to be complied with and follow the intention behind the legislation, namely to have an independent review of the process and provide recommendation to the decision-making body accordingly. This has some similarities with the process that the Independent Persons are involved in relating to Councillor Conduct issues where they are consulted before the Standards Committee determines whether a breach of the Code of Conduct has taken place. However, there do seem to be alternatives to the proposal in appendix 1 which include having a panel which includes elected members (which would also presume to have a political balance to the panel as well as the Independent Person membership). This has not been proposed for two reasons; the Council's Personnel Committee will already be involved in the process and it maintains the independence of the panel. However, the Council needs to be aware of the options available.

5.10 It is intended that further adjustments will be presented to Council as issues are determined.

### **AUDIT COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE**

5.11 There is a requirement in the Constitution for all Committees to annually review their terms of reference at their first meeting following Annual Council. The Audit Committee did this at their meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2015.

5.12 The Audit Committee requires some changes to paragraphs 7 and 9 of their terms of reference to reflect the changes below and to allow the first Caldicott Guardian Annual Report to be presented to the 15<sup>th</sup> September 2015 Audit Committee:

- a) Paragraph 7. Meet privately with the external auditor as required.
- b) Paragraph 9 - That the Caldicott Guardian will present an Annual report to the Committee as part of good governance; and
- c) Paragraph 9 - That the Commercial Board has not met for a while and no longer exists and that oversight should be of commercial projects.

5.13 – The full details are shown in the Appendix to this report.

### **6.0 EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES**

6.1 All Disciplinary issues will be managed with specific regard to equality legislation and principles.

### **7.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**

7.1 There are no environmental considerations in relation to the changes to national legislation.

## **8.0 LEGAL COMMENT**

8.1 The regulations amend previous regulations made in 2001 in relation to these senior staff members. These are made in accordance with powers of the Secretary of State to require local authorities to adopt standing orders in relation to their staff.

8.2 The provisions apply to the statutory posts of Head of Paid Services, Chief Finance Officer and Monitoring Officer and the Council must make the changes to the constitution and other relevant procedures no later than the Council meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> July 2015.

8.3 The panel which includes the Independent Persons is a committee appointed by the authority under section 102(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 for the purposes of advising the Council on matters relating to the relevant officers of the authority. This means that the panel members can be made up solely of IP's and have voting rights but can only advise the Council. The proposal in Appendix 1 presumes that there are no elected members on the panel but that is a matter for full Council to decide. Further, political balance is assumed for the panel and accordingly recommendation 2.3 needs to be agreed by the Council without any member of the Council voting against the recommendation.

8.4 The Independent Person is a role established at section 28 of the Localism Act 2011. The role is subject to statutory criteria for eligibility and the appointments are made by full Council. The current Independent Persons for the Council were appointed in September 2012 and their term of office was extended by full Council on 5<sup>th</sup> March 2015 with a further review to take place in 2018. If one or both of the Independent Persons is not able to take part in the advisory committee, officers will look to invite Independent Person(s) from another authority to form the panel.

8.5 It should be noted that as the process proposed in this report relates to the Head of Paid Service, Monitoring Officer and Chief Finance Officer, the process for disciplinary and dismissal proceedings for other Directors of the Council is unchanged. This is reflected by the changes set out at Appendix 1 of this report.

8.6 Regarding the changes proposed for the terms of reference of the Audit Committee, it should be noted that the changes and additional responsibilities recommended in the report can be added to the remit of the work of the Committee if the Council considers it appropriate to do so. The proposals can help to ensure that the work of the Audit Committee assists the Council in meeting statutory obligations, in particular in relation to internal audit requirements (as set out in legislation such as The Accounts and Audit regulations 2015).

## **9.0 LINKS WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES**

9.1 The effective delivery of Council priorities requires legal management processes. This report ensures that disciplinary frameworks for Statutory Officers comply with national legislation.

## **10.0 OPPORTUNITIES AND RISKS**

10.1 The key risk in connection with the recommendations in this report is that the Council fails to implement processes which comply with legislative requirements. The recommendations remove this risk and further reports will respond to expected developments in the near future.

## **11.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

11.1 The new arrangements introduce an additional element into disciplinary matters relating to Statutory Officers. This may require some additional training for Independent Persons. It is not anticipated that the cost of this will be great as it can be delivered in house should any cases arise.

## **12.0 WARD IMPLICATIONS**

12.1 None

## **13.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2015 (SI 2015/881), ("the Regulations").

Localism Act 2011

***Report prepared by John Harris People Services Manager Tel: 01952 383520, Matt Cumberbatch Legal Services Manager Tel: 01952 383233 and Jenny Marriott 01952 383101***

## **APPENDIX 1**

Insert into the terms of reference for full **Council**:-

*“The appointment or dismissal of the head of the authority’s paid service or the dismissal of the authority’s monitoring officer or chief finance officer”*

Insert the following provisions into the **Officer Employment Procedure Rules**

Reference to the Local Authorities (Standing Orders)(England) Regulations 2001 be changed to included ... *“(as amended)”*

Section 6 - Disciplinary Action in respect of the Head of Paid Service, the Monitoring Officer or the Chief Finance Officer.

6.1 – no proposed amendments

6.2 – delete and replace with:-

*No disciplinary action may be taken in respect of the Council’s designated Head of Paid Service, Monitoring Officer or Chief Finance Officer except after consideration of any advice, views or recommendations provided by the Panel*

7.

7.1 delete and replace with:\_

*Full Council will decide whether or not to approve the dismissal of the Council’s designated Head of Paid Service, Monitoring Officer or Chief Finance Officer only after taking into account recommendations from the Personnel Committee and any advice, views or recommendations from the Panel and after hearing representations, if any, from the officer who is the subject of the disciplinary process*

### **The Panel**

Council to approve the creation of a Panel including 2 Independent Persons members for the purposes of giving advice, views or recommendations to full Council when considering whether or not to approve the dismissal of the Council’s designated Head of Paid Service, Monitoring Officer or Chief Finance Officer

### **Terms of Reference of the Panel**

*To give advice, views or recommendations to full Council when considering whether or not to approve the dismissal of the Council's designated Head of Paid Service, Monitoring Officer or Chief Finance Officer*

*When considering whether or not to give any advice, views or recommendations and what advice, views or recommendations to give the Panel shall have regard to the decision of the Personnel Committee and the hearing and background papers and the notes of any such hearing*

*The Panel will convene a meeting that will take place within 7 days of being appointed and they will be supported by representatives from People Services and Legal Services (or appropriately qualified external advisers in circumstances make it more appropriate)*

*The Panel must be appointed at least 20 days before a meeting of full Council to consider whether or not to approve a proposal to dismiss the Council's designated Head of Paid Service, Monitoring Officer or Chief Finance Officer.*

### **Membership**

*Two Independent Persons as appointed by the Personnel Committee from time to time:-*

- 1. At least one independent person appointed by Council in accordance with the provisions of s28(7) of the Localism Act 2011 who is registered as a local government elector in the register of electors in Telford & Wrekin in accordance with the Representation of the Peoples Acts – one of whom shall be appointed to be Chair of the Panel if ; and*
- 2. An independent person appointed by Council; and/or*
- 3. An independent person who has been appointed by another authority or authorities*

### **Allowances**

No allowances are payable for this role.

Currently the independent persons receive no allowances to undertake their role and have been used rarely since they have been in role. Members need to consider whether or not the continuation of this arrangement is appropriate in the circumstances as the implications for the authority and the officers concerned are more serious than exist for members under the existing code of conduct regime. It is suggested that an allowance might be appropriate to cover the potential complexity of such matters and the requirement for regular refresher training to ensure that independent persons are competent to undertake this role. It is proposed that this issue be considered at a later stage when a clearer national position is available.

Insert into the terms of reference of the Council's **Personnel Committee**

*The invitation of Independent Persons to be considered for appointment to the Panel; and*

*The appointment of 2 Independent Persons to a Panel to advise full Council whether or not to approve a proposal to dismiss the Council's designated Head of Paid Service, Monitoring Officer or Chief Finance Officer.*

7.2 The dismissal of Directors must not be made until the Personnel Board:-

a) notify the Proper Officer of the name of the proposed dismissee and any other particulars which are considered relevant to the dismissal;  
b) the Proper Officer has notified every member of the Leader and Cabinet Executive of:-

i) the name of the proposed dismissee;  
ii) any other relevant particulars as notified to him/her;  
iii) the period within which any objection to the making of the decision is to be made by the Leader on behalf of the Leader and Cabinet Executive to the Proper Officer.

And

c) either

i) the Leader, within the specified time period, notifies the Proper Officer that neither he nor any other member of the Leader and Cabinet Executive has any objection to the dismissal;  
ii) the Proper Officer has notified the Panel no objection has been received; or  
iii) the Panel is satisfied that any objection received from the Leader is not material or is not well founded.

Members will not be involved in the dismissal of any officer below Director except where such involvement is necessary for any investigation or inquiry into alleged misconduct or incapability

### **Paragraph 9 Personnel Committee Terms of Reference**

Consider whether or not to suspend any statutory officer to enable investigations into allegations to take place, to consider disciplinary actions against statutory officers prior to submission to the Independent Persons appointed to the Council and recommendation to Full Council.

### **REVISED TERMS OF REFERENCE AUDIT COMMITTEE**

#### **PARAGRAPH 7**

7. Meet privately with the external auditor as required.

#### **PARAGRAPH 9**

9. Consider the effectiveness of the Council's governance processes and their compliance with legislation and best practice including:

- a) the Council's Code of Corporate Governance;
- b) the Council's information security framework;
- c) receipt of the Caldicott Guardian's Annual report;
- d) oversight of Commercial projects;
- e) the management of opportunities and risks; and
- f) other corporate governance arrangements.

## TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL - ANTI-FRAUD AND CORRUPTION POLICY 2015

### 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Council through this policy clearly demonstrates its zero tolerance commitment to dealing with fraud, bribery and corruption and will deal equally with perpetrators from inside (members<sup>1</sup> and employees<sup>2</sup>) and outside the Council.
- 1.2 The policy outlines measures designed to frustrate attempted fraud, bribes or corruption (defined in Appendix A) and the steps that will be taken if such action occurs. It is separated into four areas:-
1. Culture
  2. Prevention/Deterrence
  3. Detection and Investigation
  4. Training
- 1.3 The Council also recognises the high degree of external scrutiny of its affairs by a variety of external bodies. These bodies are important in highlighting any areas where improvements to anti-fraud, anti bribery and anti corruption activities can be made.

### 2. CULTURE

- 2.1 The Council's co-operative values include openness and honesty which supports the Council's commitment to zero tolerance in respect to fraud, bribery and corruption.
- 2.2 The prevention and detection of fraud, bribery or corruption and the protection of the public purse are responsibilities of everyone, both internal and external to the organisation. The anti-fraud, bribery and corruption culture and associated procedures assist the Council in its management of the risk of fraud, bribery and corruption against the Council and are an integral part of its governance framework.
- 2.3 The Council's members, employees, partners, volunteers and governors play an important role in creating and maintaining this culture. They are positively encouraged to raise concerns regarding fraud, bribery and corruption, regardless of seniority, rank or status, in the knowledge that such concerns will be investigated and wherever possible be treated in confidence<sup>3</sup>. Suppliers/contractors to the Council and the public also have roles to play in this process and should inform the Council if they feel that fraud, bribery or corruption may have occurred. Examples of types of concerns are listed in Annex 1.
- 2.4 The Council will deal firmly and take appropriate action against those who defraud the Council or who are corrupt. There is, of course, a need to ensure that any investigation process is not misused and, therefore, any abuse (such as employees/members raising malicious allegations) will also be dealt with appropriately.
- 2.5 When fraud, bribery or corruption has occurred due to a breakdown in the Council's systems or procedures, senior managers will ensure that appropriate improvements in systems of control are implemented within a reasonable timeframe to prevent a re-occurrence.

### 3. PREVENTION & DETERRENCE

<sup>1</sup> The term "members" is used in the policy to include elected, co-opted and independent members.

<sup>2</sup> The term employees is used in the policy to include employees, temporary staff, volunteers, partners

<sup>3</sup> The Council's Speak Up policy sets out how concerns can be raised (including anonymous information) and how they will be dealt with, including allegations in respect to fraud and corruption.

### **3.1 MEMBERS**

3.1.1 All members of the Council have a duty to the citizens of the Borough to protect the Council and public money from any acts of fraud, bribery or corruption. This is achieved through the Anti-Fraud and Corruption Policy, compliance with the Code of Conduct for Members, the Council's Constitution<sup>4</sup>, relevant legislation and any other protocols and procedures adopted by the Council.

### **3.2 EMPLOYEES**

3.2.1 The Role of the Chief Financial Officer – one of the Assistant Directors<sup>5</sup> has been designated the statutory responsibilities of the Chief Financial Officer as defined by s151 of the Local Government Act 1972. These responsibilities are set out in Annex 2.

3.2.2 Employees and their managers are responsible for controls and ensuring that adequate systems of internal control exist within their areas of responsibility, that these controls operate effectively and that they test them regularly to confirm this. They should also operate so as to prevent and detect fraud and implement appropriate controls into new/developed systems and new controls into existing systems to reduce the risk of fraud occurring or recurring.

3.2.3 Managers at all levels are responsible for managing the risk of fraud, bribery and corruption through:

- a) Recruitment – following the Council's recruitment policies and procedures
- b) Appropriate induction and training in order for their staff to do their job
- c) Their adherence to and promotion of the Council's Values and the Employee Code of Conduct
- d) Providing awareness of the Council's constitution, appropriate policies and procedures (key documents associated with this policy are listed in Annex 2)
- e) Regular reminders, updates and vigilance in respect to fraud, bribery & corruption
- f) Encouraging staff to raise concerns with them or through the Speak Up policy

### **3.3 MEMBERS & EMPLOYEES**

3.3.1 Both members and employees must ensure that they avoid situations where there is a potential for a conflict of interest<sup>6</sup>. Such situations can arise particularly with planning and land issues, procurement (especially tendering), recruitment etc. Effective role separation is essential to ensure decisions made are based upon impartial advice to maintain public confidence in the Council's decision-making processes and avoid questions about improper disclosure of confidential information.

3.3.2 All members and officers are expected to fully co-operate with whoever is conducting fraud, bribery and corruption investigations, proactive checks or data matching exercises.

### **3.4 INTERNAL AUDIT**

3.4.1 Internal Audit plays a vital preventative role in ensuring that systems and procedures are in place to prevent and deter fraud, bribery and corruption and has specific rights within the constitution (see Annex 2). Internal Audit investigates all employee cases of suspected financial irregularity, fraud, bribery or corruption<sup>7</sup>, except Benefit fraud investigations (see below), in accordance with agreed procedures. Internal Audit liaises with management to recommend changes in procedures to improve controls, reduce risks and prevent losses to the Authority.

---

<sup>4</sup> Including Financial Regulations and Standing Orders

<sup>5</sup> Assistant Director Finance, Audit & Information Governance

<sup>6</sup> Conflicts could also arise where employees have additional employment outside the Council but this is managed through the Private Works procedure.

<sup>7</sup> Except where they are referred to the Police when they may leave it to the Police or assist, as appropriate

### **3.5 BENEFITS INVESTIGATION TEAM**

- 3.5.1 Benefits administration is recognised nationally as being complex and difficult to administer. This results in the scheme being prone to error and abuse. The Authority is committed to tackling poverty but it must also ensure that the administration of housing and council tax benefit is secure, fair and provides prompt help to those who need it. Equally, it must also be vigilant in tackling fraud and error to ensure value for taxpayers' money. The Revenues & Benefits Service operates within legislation, government guidance and local procedures with the aim of improving the quality and accuracy of benefit determinations and to both prevent and reduce the incidence of fraud.
- 3.5.2 Until 1 June 2015 the Benefits Investigation Team is responsible for the investigation of welfare benefit fraud, often jointly with the Department for Works & Pensions (DWP), in accordance with legislation, agreed codes of conduct and a separate Council policy. From 1 June 2015 responsibility for investigating all instances of Housing Benefit fraud (and any Council Tax Benefit fraud prior to 1 April 2013) will transfer to the Department for Work and Pension's Single Fraud Investigation Service (SFIS). The Council's Revenues & Benefits Investigation Team will remain responsible for investigating Council Tax Support fraud and will also investigate Council Tax and Business Rates fraud. In cases where employees and/or members are involved the team will work with Internal Audit, People Services, the Monitoring Officer and appropriate senior management to ensure that correct procedures are followed.

### **3.6 DATA MATCHING**

- 3.6.1 The Council participates in all mandatory Data Matching exercises. In respect to Benefits there are also regular external exercises with HBMS (Housing Benefits Matching Service), DWP and most recently the introduction of PAYE Real Time Information (RTI) matches from HMRC. In addition internal data matching exercises are undertaken. All exercises adhere to Data Protection requirements.

### **3.7 EXTERNAL AUDIT**

- 3.7.1 Independent External Audit is an essential safeguard of the stewardship of public money. From 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015 external audit suppliers are being managed by the Public Sector Audit Appointments body who have taken over from the Audit Commission until local authorities appoint their own External Auditors. External auditors will continue to operate through a Code of Practice that is designed to test (amongst other things) the adequacy of the Council's financial systems, the arrangements for preventing/limiting the opportunity for fraud and the arrangements for the detection of fraud, bribery and corruption. It is not the external auditors' function to prevent fraud and irregularities, but the integrity of public funds is at all times a matter of general concern. External auditors are always alert to the possibility of fraud and irregularity, and will act without undue delay if grounds for suspicion come to their notice. Where External Audit is required to undertake an investigation they will operate within legislation and their codes of conduct.

### **3.8 OTHER AGENCIES**

- 3.8.1 Appropriate Council services have arranged (in compliance with the Data Protection Act 1998) the exchange of information on national and local fraud, bribery and corruption activity with appropriate external agencies.

### **3.9 CONTRACTORS/SUPPLIERS AND THE PUBLIC**

- 3.9.1 This policy, although primarily aimed at those within or associated with the Council, encourages contractors/suppliers and the public to assist in the Councils zero tolerance commitment to fraud, bribery and corruption.

### **3.10 PROSECUTION AND RECOMPENSE**

- 3.10.1 To support this policy the Council has a Corporate Prosecution Policy which is complemented by the Benefit Fraud Sanction & Prosecution Policy, which is to be replaced by the Revenues and Benefits Sanction and Penalty Policy. The corporate policy is designed to clarify and ensure consistency in the Council's action in specific cases and to deter others from committing offences against the Authority. The Benefit Fraud Sanction & Prosecution policy and Revenues and Benefits Sanction Policy ensure that Revenues and Benefits prosecutions are undertaken within the requirements of the relevant legislation.
- 3.10.2 In addition or instead of prosecution, the Council will seek to recover any money or assets fraudulently/corruptly obtained from the Council.

### **3.11 DISCIPLINARY OR OTHER ACTION**

- 3.11.1 Theft, fraud, bribery and corruption are serious offences against the Authority and employees will face disciplinary action if there is evidence that they have been involved in these activities, including Benefit fraud. Disciplinary action will be taken in addition to, or instead of, criminal proceedings depending on the circumstances of each individual case but in a consistent manner.
- 3.11.2 Members will face appropriate action under this policy if there is evidence that they have been involved in theft, fraud, bribery and corruption against the Authority. Action will be taken in addition to, or instead of criminal proceedings, depending on the circumstances of each individual case but in a consistent manner. If the matter is a potential breach of the Code of Conduct for Members then it will also be referred to the Standards Committee.

### **3.12 PUBLICITY**

- 3.12.1 The Council's Corporate Communications Team will optimise the publicity opportunities associated with anti-fraud, anti bribery and anti corruption activity within the Council. Information will be publicised in respect to prosecutions and other appropriate cases as a deterrent.
- 3.12.2 In addition the Council's Everyday App will be extended in the Summer of 2015 to include fraud reporting to make it easier for the public to report suspected cases.
- 3.12.3 Internally where the Council can learn from incidents the relevant points will be communicated to members and employees.
- 3.12.4 Any notifications received by the Council of possible regional/national frauds, scams or alerts will be communicated to employees and members, as appropriate.
- 3.13.5 All anti-fraud, anti-bribery and anti-corruption activities, including the update of this policy<sup>8</sup>, will be publicised in order to make employees, members and the public aware of the Council's commitment to taking action on fraud, bribery and corruption, when it occurs.

## **4. DETECTION AND INVESTIGATION**

- 4.1 Internal Audit plays an important role in the detection of fraud. Included in their audit plan (informed by a fraud risk register) are specific fraud tests, spot checks and unannounced visits. However it is often the vigilance of employees, partners, volunteers, members, governors, suppliers/contractors and the public that aids detection.
- 4.2 All suspected fraud, bribery and corruption irregularities (except benefit fraud) are required to be reported (verbally or in writing) to the Audit & Information Governance Manager either by the person with whom the initial concern is raised or through the Council's Speak Up policy. (See paragraph 3.4.1).

---

<sup>8</sup> This policy will be reviewed annually and updated where necessary.

## **5. AWARENESS AND TRAINING**

- 5.1 The Council recognises that the continuing success of this policy and its general credibility will depend in part on the effectiveness of training and awareness for Members, employees and affected external parties. The principles of this policy are integrated into the officer and member's induction programme and incorporated in the Member Development programme. Specialist training for certain employees is provided by their service area due to their specific roles.
- 5.2 Regular awareness through corporate communication, staff news and Ollie will support the successful application of this policy. Full copies of the Anti-Fraud and Corruption and Speak Up policies are available on the intranet.

## DEFINITIONS OF FRAUD, BRIBERY & CORRUPTION

**Fraud** is defined by the Audit Commission as:-

Fraud – “*the intentional distortion of financial statements or other records by persons internal or external to the authority which is carried out to conceal the misappropriation of assets or otherwise for gain*”.

In addition, fraud can also be defined as “*the intentional distortion of financial statements or other records by persons internal or external to the authority which is carried out to mislead or misrepresent*”.

The Fraud Act 2006 which came into effect on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2007 created a new general offence of fraud with three ways of committing it:

- Fraud by false representation
- Fraud by failing to disclose information
- Fraud by abuse of position

It also created new offences:

- Obtaining services dishonestly
- Possessing, making and supplying articles for use in frauds
- Fraudulent trading applicable to non-corporate traders.

**Corruption** is defined by the Audit Commission as:-

Corruption – “*the offering, giving, soliciting or acceptance of an inducement or reward which may influence the action of any person*”.

In addition, this policy also covers “*the failure to disclose an interest in order to gain financial or other pecuniary benefit.*”

**Bribery** is defined under the Act as:-

A bribe is a financial or other advantage that is offered or requested with the intention of inducing or rewarding the improper performance of a relevant function or activity, or with the knowledge or belief that the acceptance of such an advantage would constitute the improper performance of such a function or activity.

## EXAMPLES OF THE TYPES CONCERNS that should be raised:

- \* A criminal offence
- \* A failure to comply with a statutory or legal obligation
- \* Improper or unauthorised use of public or other official funds
- \* A miscarriage of justice
- \* Maladministration, misconduct or malpractice
- \* Discriminatory behaviour
- \* Endangering an individuals health and/or safety
- \* Damage to the environment
- \* Benefit Fraud
- \* That offers or requests have been made in respect to a promise, gift, financial or other advantage to or from a person that results in improper performance of a decision or action
- \* Deliberate concealment of any of the above

## **Roles and Responsibilities of the Chief Financial Officer (CFO) in respect to Financial Affairs including Fraud & Corruption**

Section 151 of the Local Government Act (1972) sets out that in every local authority in England & Wales should:

“make arrangements for the proper administration of their financial affairs and shall secure that one of their officers has the responsibility for the administration of those affairs”.

Section 114 of the Local Government Finance Act (LGFA) 1988 requires the Chief Financial Officer to report to the Council if the authority, one of its committees, the Leader and Cabinet Executive or one of its officers:

- Has made – or is about to make – a decision which has or would result in unlawful expenditure;
- Has taken, or is about to take, an unlawful action which has or would result in a loss or deficiency to the authority; or
- Is about to make an unlawful entry in the Council’s accounts.

Section 114 of the LGFA 1988 also requires the Chief Financial Officer to nominate a properly qualified member of staff to deputise, should the Chief Financial Officer be unable to perform the duties under Section 114 personally.

Under the Constitution the CFO responsibilities of proper administration encompasses all aspects of local authority financial management including:

- provision of financial advice for service delivery, strategic planning and policy making across the authority;
- provision of advice on the optimum use of available resources on the management of capital and revenue budgets;
- provision of financial management information;
- preparation of statutory and other accounts, associated grant claims and supporting records;
- provision of an effective internal audit function and assistance to management in providing safe and efficient financial arrangements;
- the proper exercise of a wide range of delegated powers both formal and informal;
- provision of effective financial management systems and procedures;
- provision of effective income collection and payments systems;
- advising on treasury, investment and cash-flow management;
- advising on the safe custody of assets and insurance; and
- The recognition of the fiduciary responsibility owed to local tax payers.

### **KEY COUNCIL DOCUMENTS THAT SUPPORT THIS POLICY**

(This list contains examples but is not exhaustive)

- Constitution
- Financial Regulations and Standing Orders and associated detailed procedures
- Fraud Response Plan
- Employee Code of Conduct
- Health and Safety Policies
- Corporate Information Security Policy (which includes the E-mail and Internet Usage Policies and IT Strategy).
- Gifts and Hospitality Guidance
- Equalities policies
- Private Works Procedure

## **CONSTITUTION POWERS FOR REPRESENTATIVES OF INTERNAL AUDIT**

(Part 4 – Rules of Procedure: Section 6 – Financial Regulations paragraph 9.7)

9.7 The Chief Finance Officer's authorised Internal Audit representatives shall be empowered to:

- enter at all reasonable times any Council premises or land
- have access to all Council and partner records (includes business e-mails and internet records), documentation and correspondence relating to any financial and/or other transactions or other business of the Council, its employees or members, as considered necessary by the CFO, Monitoring Officer or Audit & Information Governance Manager.
- have access to records belonging to third parties such as contractors or partners when required
- require and receive such explanations as are regarded necessary concerning any matter under examination from any employee, member, partner or third party.
- require any employee or member of the Council or any partner/third party to account for cash, stores or any other Council property which is under his/her control or possession on behalf of the Council.

## **BOUNDARY REVIEW COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes of a meeting of the Boundary Review Committee held on Thursday 29<sup>th</sup> January 2015 at 5.50pm in Meeting Room G3, Addenbrooke House, Telford**

**PRESENT:** Councillors Cllr R Sloan (Chair), K Blundell, E Carter, I Fletcher, A McClements and R Overton

**IN ATTENDANCE:** J Eatough (Assistant Director: Law, Democracy & People Services), P Griffiths (Democratic Services Manager) and P Smith (Democratic Services Team Leader)

#### **BRC-10      MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – that the minutes of the meeting held on 18 December 2014 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

#### **BRC-11      APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Councillor P Watling

#### **BRC-12      DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

#### **BRC-13      REVIEW OF POLLING DISTRICTS AND POLLING PLACES**

The Democratic Services Manager presented the report of the Assistant Director: Law, Democracy & People Services which was tabled together with a pack of background information which contained an analysis of polling districts, proposed polling stations and ward maps.

At the last meeting, the Committee agreed the proposals for polling districts and polling places in the Borough for consultation. The consultation period ended on 26<sup>th</sup> January 2015, and a small number of comments were received. Having taken account of the consultation responses, and having undertaken further work on the proposals, some changes to the original proposals were being recommended. The document appended to the report showed a summary of the recommendations of the Returning Officer for each of the 30 wards, with any changes to the original proposals highlighted.

The main changes were as follows:

##### **Apley Castle Ward**

The Returning Officer had looked at using Apley School as a polling station, but this would likely lead to the closure of the school on the day of the election. It was recommended therefore that Apley Castle electors continue to vote at Leegomery Community Centre, even though it was now just outside the ward. Councillor Blundell

stated that there had been some confusion in the past with Leegomery Community Centre being used as a dual polling station for both Apley Castle and Hadley & Leegomery. The Democratic Services Manager advised that there might be a need to look at this again in the future, but for now it was probably the best option in terms of continuity.

#### Dawley and Aqueduct Ward

For electors in TDZ polling district, it was recommended that they now vote at Southall School rather than using the portacabin at Beechwood Road. A new polling district TDP had been formed, with those electors formerly in TDA polling district now being able to vote at Dawley Christian Centre, which was nearer to their homes than Web Youth Centre. Remaining TDA electors would continue to vote at Web Youth Centre.

#### Haygate

A request for an additional polling station at Hesba Close had been received as part of the consultation process, and Members were asked to consider the option to divide the polling district. Cllr McClements advised that there had been complaints from elderly people who had to walk a considerable distance to get to the single polling station at Wellington Civic Centre. The Democratic Services Manager stated that the building at Hesba Close was owned by the Council, but there hadn't been an opportunity yet to assess the suitability or feasibility of the premises for use as a polling station.

#### Horsehay & Lightmoor

The suggestion from Lawley & Overdale Parish Council to use their Offices as a polling station for THL polling district had been investigated. The room available was on the first floor of the building at Lawley Square, West Centre Way but had lift access for people with disabilities. This location seemed to provide a better alternative than Lawley Community Centre which had been used previously, and was therefore recommended for use as the polling station for electors in Polling District THL.

#### Ironbridge Gorge

For electors in the new TIH polling district, it had been intended to use Abraham Darby Academy as the polling station. However, the room available was very small and unsuitable for a combined election. It was therefore recommended instead that TIH electors vote at Woodlands Primary School together with voters from the neighbouring TMD Madeley polling district.

#### Ketley & Overdale

An option for electors in TLE polling district to vote at the TA Centre in Cavan Drive, Dawley was being investigated, but there had not been a positive response from the Centre. Therefore it was likely that Dawley Baptist Church would be retained as the polling station for TLE voters even though it was now located in an adjoining ward.

### Madeley and Sutton Hill

It was recommended that electors in TMD polling district who had previously voted at Abraham Darby Academy would now use Woodlands Primary School along with TIH electors from Ironbridge Gorge ward. This would enable all voters from this area to vote at the same polling station.

### Muxton

A number of electors in the Humber Lane area (polling district WMH) had transferred to Muxton ward from Donnington ward. They had previously voted at Turreff Hall polling station, which was outside the Muxton ward. However, on balance, it was considered that this arrangement could continue, given that the other option would be to have a third station at Muxton Community Centre, which might be difficult to support. A suggestion was made as to whether the NAAFI building at MoD Donnington might be suitable. The Democratic Services Manager agreed to check this option before making a final decision.

### Oakengates and Ketley Bank

For electors in WOL polling district the most likely option was for a polling station at Telford Motor Auctions at Trench Lock, with a portacabin sited in the polling district as a fall back option. Voters in the Cockshutt area (TOW polling district) who had previously been in St Georges ward would now vote at the Oakengates United Church within their new ward.

### St Georges

Minor changes to polling district arrangements for new Parish wards of Wrockwardine Wood East (Wrockwardine Wood & Trench PC) and Snedshill (St Georges & Priorslee PC)

### The Nedge

Electors in the TTH polling district from the Holmer Lake area had been allocated to vote at the Sambrook Centre, Grange Avenue.

Members stressed the importance of making voters aware if they were in a new polling district and/or voting at a different polling station in the May elections. The Democratic Services Manager advised that any changes in arrangements would be highlighted on the polling cards, and information would be placed on the Council website. In relation to the new warding arrangements in Newport it was suggested that publicity and information could be provided at the Town Council offices. The Assistant Director advised that existing elected Members would be notified of any changes in their ward.

### **RESOLVED –**

- (a) that, with the exception of the Haygate and Muxton wards, the Returning Officer's Recommendations for the adoption of Polling Districts and Polling Places, in accordance with the Representation of the People Act 1983 and the Electoral Administration Act 2006, be approved;**

- (b) that authority be delegated to the Assistant Director: Law, Democracy & People Services, in consultation with the Chair, to finalise the arrangements for Haygate and Muxton wards following further investigation of the polling station options.**

The meeting ended at 6.26 p.m.

**Chairman:** .....

**Date:** .....

## **CO-OPERATIVE & COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEES**

**Minutes of a meeting of the Co-operative & Communities Scrutiny Committee held on Tuesday, 24<sup>th</sup> March 2015 at 6.00pm in Meeting Room 3, Darby House, Lawn Central, Telford TF3 4JA.**

**PRESENT:** Cllrs. A. McClements (Chair), N. England, J. Pinter, and co-opted member J. Ellis.

Also attending: Cllr. S. Davies; Cabinet Member, Neighbourhood Services Employment and Skills, R. Partington; Managing Director, Telford & Wrekin Council, Lois Stewart, Organisational Development Manager, Fiona Bottrill; Scrutiny Group Specialist.

**APOLOGIES:** None

### **CCSC-15    MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – that the minutes of the meetings of the Co-operative & Communities Scrutiny Committee held on 19<sup>th</sup> August 2014 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

### **CCSC-16    APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Cllrs. J. Thompson and K. Tomlinson

### **CCSC-17    DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None

### **CCSC-18    EMPLOYEE COMMISSION AND CO-OPERATIVE VALUES**

The Chair welcomed the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services, Employment and Skills and the Managing Director to the meeting. The Chair explained the Scrutiny Committee had carried out a review on 2011/12 on the Council's Co-operative Values and Employee Commission. Members of the Committee spoke to staff across the organisation making sure they covered different service areas and buildings. The Members asked staff:

Were they aware of the Co-operative values and did they affect their work?  
Were there any other issues they wanted to raise?  
Did they know about Scrutiny?

The Chair said that this had been a good piece of work which had found that staff were aware of the values and many of them said that they were already part of the way they worked. The Cabinet Member and Managing Director had been invited to attend the meeting to update the Committee on this work. The Chair said she was particularly interested to hear how the Managing Director and Senior Management Team are communication with staff.

The Managing Director said that the work involved in communicating is such a large and complex organisation is never finished but progress is being made. He said that in the recent engagement sessions it has been recognised that this has to be carried out in such a way that it is meaningful to staff. Staff are aware of the financial challenges the organisation faces and need to be given the opportunity to understand how they can help.

The 'Bigger Picture' is a simple way of engaging staff. This was developed through 25 workshops held over 11 days. At these events the all staff were free to speak and explain what is good and what are the values of the organisation.

The feedback from this event was that people feel proud to work for the Council. Staff thought that the management are trying to do the right thing. A poster has been produced that provides an image which sets out the Council's story so far. An interactive version of this will be available and a set of tools for managers to engage with staff. It is important for the organisation to have a narrative and be able to build on this.

The Managing Director said that the feedback from staff was very positive. He has carried out a second annual tour to talk about the Bigger Picture. In these presentations he explained where the Council is now, what it has achieved and where the Council in going. This has been presented in the context of the financial challenge. Over 400 employees attended these events and applauded at the end of the session. It is essential to be honest with people and say that not everyone will continue to be part of the team as the Council gets smaller. The Council's approach has been to generate income to mitigate the cuts and protect services. The budget strategy has included investment which has not been the case in other areas. Most Council's are not making investments. This approach has been commended by other organisations, e.g. free swimming for over 50s.

The Council has also been looking at policies to ensure these are efficient. This has not been a top down approach but working with employees, Trade Unions and managers. An example of this is the flexi deal which enabled employees to work more flexible hours, buy annual leave and achieve a better work life balance.

The Chair asked if there had been feedback from staff about restructures and that this can make them feel very vulnerable.

The Managing Director explained that over the last 6-9 months there had been a reduction in the number of re-structures. The whole council has been re-designed

about 3 times. However, this has not been done all at the same time and which has made it more manageable. To be able to carry out restructures in this way requires vision. The approach to the restructures has been 'how do we design a service and will still work and save money?' He gave the example of the in-house adult care provider. Through dialogue with the staff and the trade unions it was restructured so that it could become a competitive service that would be bought by individuals.

The Managing Director said that there is still too much silo working and that there would be more restructures. It has also been recognised that it is important to continue to invest in learning and development and much of this will take place through the online learning platform OLLIE.

L. Stewart explained that the approach to learning and development is a 'blended approach'. Some training is online and some is face to face. During 2014 there had been the biggest recorded number of training courses delivered through OLLIE. There have been 12,400 individual course participants.

The Chair asked how the training is evaluated?

The Managing Director said that doing a course is not always the best way to learn.

L. Stewart said that OLLIE is good at driving knowledge and that the blended approach to learning means that the online courses can be followed up by 1 hour briefing sessions or 1-1 training. Coaching or mentoring is a good way to understand the impact of learning. At the end of the training participants are asked for feedback and then later asked if they are using this knowledge. It is important that people take responsibility for their own learning and development but they also need support from managers. L. Stewart added that the Co-operative Values are embedded in the organisations and that these values are very strong. The 1-1 framework has been reviewed and now reflect the values and provide staff feedback on these. In the difficult financial climate there is a temptation to feel 'down' but in this organisation there is a level of optimism.

The Chair said that the ethos of an organisation is very important.

Cllr. S. Davies said that the optimism of the organisation is reflected in the number of apprentices, which is now 165. In every team there are people who are here to learn and this motivates other people to learn. He gave the example of the trainee solicitor who was sponsored by the Council and is now employed here. The Cabinet Members have continued their 'walk-about' and Cllr. S. Davies said that officers email him directly and that it is important that staff are given the recognition for the work that they carry out. He added that it is also important for senior officers to know the different communities in Telford and Wrekin, and this has been helped by councillors carrying out 'ward walks' with senior officers. This will help people to understand the impact of the decisions that are being made. It is also important that people in Telford and Wrekin understand that public servants at the Council work very hard for the benefit of the local community

Mr. J. Ellis said that he had been surprised that the values had to be stated in such an obvious way since, when he worked for the Council, this was the way people had worked. He had noticed that when other people came to work for the Council they often commented that the culture was different at Telford & Wrekin. He said he felt it was sad that things at the Council had changed so much that a Co-operative Commission had to be set up to bring back these values. As an co-optee on the Committee he said that he supported the co-operative values.

Cllr. S. Davies responded that the decision to be a Co-operative Council means putting this into practice on a day to day basis. Parts of the Council had embraced this quickly but others were slower to take this up. As a new member in 2011 he had been keen to see the top of the organisation becoming flatter. This has been achieved, and managing Director is the first Head of Paid Service at the Council to be directly responsible for a service area. The Council's relationship with the Town and Parish Council's has improved. Previously regeneration has been 'done' to areas rather than with them. An example of this has been the solar farm – in other areas there have been protests, but because the Council here had worked with people to explain the reason and the benefits there had been no objections here. Another example of how the relationship with the Town and Parish Council's has improved is the Parish Environmental Teams (PETS) and the Community Support Officer Training.

The Managing Director said the Council has changed since he joined in 1991. He confirmed that the Cabinet and Senior Management Team had worked in partnership and had not taken the 'easy decision' to close services, but rather how to keep the service going for less money. The Cabinet has had high expectations and this is reflected in the aspirations for Telford and Wrekin – which is 'on the up'. It is important that people enjoy their work.

Cllr. N. England said that he had worked for the Council until 2004 and stood for election in 2011. He had jointed the Co-operative and Communities Scrutiny Committee in 2013. He explained that he understood that the Co-operative Council meant there was a different way of working. He gave the example of an environment issues that needs to be resolved. Previously this may have been fully funded by the Council but now the way to address this is for the Council to work with other organisations to find additional sources of funding. He also said that it is important that all staff have access to the information they need, not just about how to do their job but also about the wider organisation.

Cllr. S. Davies responded that this can be a cultural issue within an organisation. There are some staff who do not have access to a Council computer – but they can opt to receive some emails to their personal email address.

Cllr. N. England added that it is important to retain staff as this reduces the cost of recruitment.

L. Stewart said that she had read about the Council's co-operative values before she

started working here. Once she joined the organisation it was clear that they are part of the organisation at every level and that what matters is making a difference of the local community.

The Chair said that this was reflected in the comments made by staff during the Scrutiny Review.

Cllr. N. England added that when asked about the Co-operative values many staff responded that this is what they already do.

The Managing Director said that accountability is important – people can hear what you say, but if they see that something has changes, that we do what we say, that is how they will judge the organisation.

J. Ellis said that this approach in empowering for staff.

Cllr. S. Davies said that there are some things that only the Council can do, e.g. leading the bid for the MOS Centre at Donnington, but there are other issues where the Community can be enable to help itself. He gave the example of the Pride in the Community Programme.

The Managing Director said that it is important that people are clear about the purpose of the Council. The restructure process is not easy, but it is about being clear what we do and why. This is why there are planned briefings during the restructure process. The Council has minimised the number of compulsory redundancies to around 50 when about 1,200 jobs have gone. Some people find a new job in the Council others decide not to stay.

Cllr. S. Davies added that the Council gives a lot of support to people who are at risk of being made redundant.

The Managing Director said that the Council has worked with the Trade Unions. He has to sign off every voluntary and compulsory redundancy - the process has to be fair.

J. Ellis commented on the previous values stated by the Council: Quality, Caring, Fairness. He added that he is happy that the Council has recognised the importance of these.

Cllr. S. Davies said that the way the Council implements the Co-operative Values has evolved e.g. the Employee Commission now works through focus groups and forums. If, after the elections in May, he is part of the administration, the Council will not go back to the beginning of the process but will continue to develop the Cooperative values.

J. Ellis asked of all Councillors had 'bought into' the Co-operative Values?

Cllr. S. Davies said that the Co-operative Ward Fund had been £1,000 and had doubled to £2,000. Nearly all Councillors have taken part in this programme. As part of the Pride in the Community Fund process there was a cross party group evaluating the applications.

The Chair said that the Council is making progress and it has been very useful to have this update. She thanked the Cabinet Member and Managing Director for attending the meeting.

**CCSC-19    CHAIR'S UPDATE**

The Chair said that this was the last meeting in the cycle for this year. She thanked everyone for their support and work. She said that the key pieces of work that she was proud of included the work on the implications of welfare reform, the Review of First Point for Business and the Review of Community Centres. This highlights the role of Scrutiny and the difference it can make.

J. Ellis asked about the work of other Scrutiny Committees. He said that the community aspect is very important and when looking at the Council's budget this should not just focus on finance. He also expressed an interest in being involved in the work that will take place next year on the Council's bus subsidy policy.

The meeting ended at 6.48pm

**Chairman:**.....

**Date:**.....

## **HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD**

Minutes of a meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on Wednesday 21<sup>st</sup> January 2015 at 2.00pm in Meeting Room G3, Ground Floor, Addenbrooke House, Ironmasters Way, Telford TF3 4NT.

**PRESENT:** Cllr R Overton (Chair) (Telford and Wrekin Council), Dr M Innes (Vice-Chair) (Clinical Commissioning Group), Cllr A England (Telford and Wrekin Council), Cllr E Clare (Telford and Wrekin Council), P Taylor (Telford and Wrekin Council), Cllr G Green (Telford and Wrekin Council), Cllr J Seymour (Telford and Wrekin Council), Liz Noakes (Telford and Wrekin Council), J Chaplin (Healthwatch Telford and Wrekin), Cllr P Watling, (Telford and Wrekin Council), D Evans (Clinical Commissioning Group) and

Also Present: H Onions (Consultant in Public Health), M Bennett (Head of Commissioning, Integrated Care), L Cartwright (Interim Head of Commissioning, Planned Care/Long Term Conditions), Julia Meakin (Interim Head of Commissioning, Planned Care/Long Term Conditions)

Officers: M Cumberbatch (Legal Services) J Power (Delivery & Planning Manager) and J Clarke (Democratic Services Officer).

### **HWB-24 MINUTES**

Cllr J Seymour commented on the Minutes of the meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> September 2014 which had been approved at the last meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board.

**RESOLVED** – that the Minutes of the meetings of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 10<sup>TH</sup> December 2014 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

### **HWB-25 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

D Wickham (NHS England Shropshire and Staffordshire Area Team), Dylan Harrison (Clinical Commissioning Group) and L Johnston (Telford and Wrekin Council)

### **HWB-26 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None

### **HWB-27 PUBLIC SPEAKING**

No members of the public had registered to speak.

### **HWB-28 BETTER CARE FUND UPDATE REPORT**

M Bennett presented the update report on the Better Care Fund (BCF). The aim of the BCF was to transform the health and social care system promoting greater independence for patients and service users.

A response from NHS England, following re-submission of the BCF was received in September 2014 which was approved with support. An Action Plan was developed and agreed with NHS England and further evidence was submitted and re-assessed. Notification was received on 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2014 that the BCF had now been classified as “Approved”. The submission was described as “. . . clear and ambitious and we support your ambitions. This puts you in a strong position for delivering the change outlined above . . .”.

This BCF Programme Board adopted a Programme Management Office approach to delivering the programme. This included the establishment of 5 work-streams:

- Community Capacity
- Single Point of Access
- Single assessment and care planning
- Integrated Community Enablement Service
- Data Sharing

M Bennett informed the Board that there had previously been a noting progress of performance due to the development of the service. From January 2015 until April 2015 there will be performance monitoring for real and the first quarter will be compared with that of last year. Payments will be made from January 2015 and this will be monitored.

Work was being undertaken on avoidance and the reduction of hospital admissions, pilot pathways, and acute hospitals.

The benchmark regarding PbR emergency admissions had been lower for five out of the 7 months so far this year. July and September had been higher, however, this rate had still been above the BCF target for all 7 months.

A sample figure from the GP Survey regarding people feeling supported was very 84% locally, which was slightly below the national average of 85%.

With regard to the indicator "Proportion of older people (65+) who were still at home 91 days after discharge from hospital into regalement/rehabilitation services", 3.9% equated to 47 people. It was hoped that this figure could be brought down to 3% which is below trend. This would mean an overall reduction of 7% but there was work to be done to achieve this.

The budget was still being worked through and the detail of the S75 and S256 agreements was still being considered. This would be in place by April 2015.

In response to questions from the Board regarding the single point of access M Bennett informed the Board that there was currently a modelling activity taking place on the single point of contact but that this was slightly behind schedule and was currently being picked up with the Lead Officers in order that independent work streams interconnect with each other. P Taylor explained that this piece of work was very complex and involved lots of agencies. It was important that the solution work and the correct pathways were in place and work was being undertaken with the CCG and NHS England to ensure that the right skills and pathways were in place.

Cllr J Seymour asked for clarification regarding the value for money impact with regard to the flow of money to the acute sector if the targets were not achieved and that this may be seen as a disincentive. M Bennett confirmed that there was a clear requirement to reduce admissions that it was a national requirement to hold back a percentage of the funding in order to reduce admissions. Engagement was currently being undertaken with SaTH and a pilot pathway was being included as part of the work together with commissioning intentions.

D Evans clarified that the BCF nationally was intended to reduce impact on the acute sector. Concerns had been expressed around the Country and it had therefore been agreed that due to the element of risk that this money be held back.

Further discussions included:

- The three month pilot scheme
- The cost of admissions
- Rate of referral
- Working with GPs and Ambulance Services, rapid response and home visits.
- Working with enablement services and developing rehabilitation services.

J Chaplin confirmed that Healthwatch would like to contribute towards the work involved and liaise with their service users.

Cllr A England noted that the Local Authority, CCG, NHS England and the voluntary sector were working together to help to keep people as healthy as possible and to be cared for by their families within their own homes. He thanked the officers across the spectrum for all of their hard work.

**RESOLVED – that**

- a) the formal approval of the Better Care Fund be noted;**
- b) the progress and development of the work streams be noted; and**
- c) the respective organisations support and facilitate approved BCF implementation within the identified timescales.**

**HWB-29      HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD PRIORITY UPDATE: LIFE EXPECTANCY**

H Onions, L Cartwright and J Meakin presented a joint report on the Health and Wellbeing Board's priority on Life Expectancy and premature mortality rates and associated JSNA intelligence on the main causes of early death in Telford & Wrekin.

The report gave an update on the life expectancy figures from December 2014. Progress on prevention programmes such as smoking and obesity had been presented as a CATP priority at an earlier Board meeting.

The collaborative work being undertaken specifically focussed on the treatment of cardiovascular disease and cancer.

Figures relating to life expectancy for the period 2011-13 were appended to the Report at Appendix 1. These figures had been released in December 2014. The key messages were:

- both male and female life expectancy was significantly worse than the average for England during 2011-13
  - Women - 1.6 years below the national average
  - Men - 1.2 years below the national average
- Both male and female life expectancy at age 65 was significantly worse than the average for England during 2011-13
  - Women – 0.7 years below the national average
  - Men – 1.0 years below the national average

The two main contributors to early deaths were cancers and cardiovascular diseases (CVD). High blood pressure was prevalent in many cases of CVD and the primary care indicator was significantly worse than the benchmark. Associated costs for hospital admissions relating to CVD and cardiac surgery procedures were high.

Reducing premature mortality was an aim shared between the NHS and Public Health. And the CCG Quality Premium was measured by the Potential Years of Life Lost Plan (PYLL). In Telford and Wrekin 80% of the PYLL was associated with CVD, cancers and respiratory diseases during 2011-13. These rates were higher than the national average and were contained within some of the Wards with the highest levels of deprivation.

The CCG, together with the Clinical Pathways Committee were working with Telford and Wrekin Council to develop a PYLL action plan based on high impact interventions known to reduce early death rates. Initiatives included:

- Improvement of CVD management in primary care
- Diagnosis and treatment of hypertension
- Health Trainers in GP Practices
- Remote blood pressure monitoring by text message

With regard to improving cancer outcomes, there was currently a lot of work being undertaken on areas such as gynaecology, breast, head and neck and skin cancers. The Macmillan Pod would be visiting Telford and would be located in the Shopping Centre (opposite New Look) from 9<sup>th</sup> to 13<sup>th</sup> February 2015. The Pod would offer an opportunity for people to get further information relating to cancer and would signpost the public to other areas of support and would be part of a national cancer campaign.

The latest figures relating to waiting times and treatment times suggested that the CCG was still not meeting the 31 days cancer treatment target, although the figure had improved slightly from 88.1% to 89.9%. It was considered difficult to achieve the Government target of 94%.

With regard to the 62 day referral to treatment target, was also still below target but gain showed some improvement from 83.2% to 84.6%

A Cancer Survival Plan was being developed and the CCG had commenced discussions around the poor survival rates that had been reported in September 2014. A West Midlands wide meeting was due to take place and any recommendations from this meeting would be reported back to the HWB. A Cancer Protected Learning Event was due to take place in February 2015 and was expected to focus on lung and breast cancer.

There had been a lot of good support from Macmillan and a strong partnership was being built.

A discussion took place around CVD which included:

- CVD inequalities between men and women
- The management of primary care
- Indicators being below the benchmark for last year
- Quality premium target plan to be brought back to HWB
- Concerns regarding life expectancy figures and the need to understand underlying issues and produce a key action plan
- Higher levels of morbidity in areas of high deprivation – the need to be proactive

- Profiling work – ie trends and hotspots
- Intervention work
- Getting people more active to reduce symptoms – eg mental health/diabetes

D Evans reported to the Board that the CCG had put in an application for delegated authority to take over the work around CVD primary care. The advantages of this were that specific local need could be investigated and more flexibly resourced. Approval was currently awaited from the Primary Care Commission.

Members discussed the figures relating to the waiting and treatment times for cancer patients. Delays in waiting and treatment times could be affected by complex needs and patient choice eg specialist provision which may lead to a delay or patient choice to attend a hospital from a different geographical area. Other factors involved patients choosing to delay their treatment eg to go on holiday. The figures involved were quite small and although the targets were not being met, it may be that only 1 or 2 patients' treatment was delayed. It was hoped that these figures would improve if the CCG received the delegated authority from the PCC.

It was important that all patients were supported and given relevant information regarding treatment and risks in order that they could make an informed decision.

The PCC had introduced an internal market in order to drive up the quality of care and drive down costs. Prevention and lifestyles messages needed to be communicated to the public regarding consulting a GP and the 1 year survival figures.

**RESOLVED – that in order to gain assurance that the collaborative action planned was adequate to impact on the poorer than average local outcomes for cardiovascular disease and cancer that the Board receive and scrutinise the cancer survival plan and the potential years of life lost plan at a future meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board.**

**HWB-30      HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD PRIORITY UPDATE: SUPPORT PEOPLE WITH DEMENTIA**

M Innes presented the report which related to the HWB priority of supporting people with dementia.

The report provided an update relating to progress against the four identified priorities for dementia which were:

- Public and Professional Awareness
- Information
- Early Identification and Diagnosis of Dementia
- End of Life Care

These priorities were in line with the recommendations set out in the Prime Minister's Challenge on Dementia and the NICE Quality Standards.

There were an estimated 1,774 people within the borough who were likely to have a diagnosis of dementia. The overall dementia diagnosis rate for Telford and Wrekin was 52.4% against the national figure of 67%.

Further work was needed regarding the End of Life Care in relation to a diagnosis of Dementia. The following priorities were highlighted:

- Carers Support
- Dementia Action Alliance (DAA) needed to be up and running again following earlier work
- Cross-Shropshire Dementia Steering Group which included Shropshire Council, CCG and TWC in order to harmonise and give the same the provision of care across Shropshire. It was suggested that the Dementia Steering Group report through the BCF CATP as a way of reporting back to the Health and Wellbeing Board.

In summary the activity on Dementia was continuing. Although the figure of 67% had not been met presently, this figure was increasing on a month by month basis. The Dementia Bus was extremely helpful in raising public awareness.

A discussion took place including:

- Community programmes to help raise public awareness and professional awareness
- Targets and diagnosis rates
- The work SaTH was undertaking to raise awareness of the symptoms of dementia
- The harmonisation of services
- The differences between dementia and memory challenges
- Mid-cognitive improvement
- The incidence of dementia within care homes and variable diagnosis rates
- Supporting people with dementia within their own homes
- Community based support
- Challenge around behaviour and understanding relapses and remissions

**RESOLVED – that**

- a) the update and progress since receipt of the last Report in July 2013 be noted;**
- b) Board Members continue to champion Dementia as a priority across the Health and Social Care Economy and to contribute to raising Public and Professional Awareness; and**
- c) the Dementia Steering Group report into the Better Care Fund CATP**

The meeting ended at 3.18pm

Chairman:

Date:

## **HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD**

Minutes of a meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on Wednesday 11<sup>th</sup> March 2015 at 2.00pm in Meeting Room G3, Ground Floor, Addenbrooke House, Ironmasters Way, Telford TF3 4NT.

**PRESENT:** Cllr R Overton (Chair) (Telford and Wrekin Council), Dr M Innes (Vice-Chair) (Clinical Commissioning Group), Cllr A England (Telford and Wrekin Council), Cllr E Clare (Telford and Wrekin Council), Cllr G Green (Telford and Wrekin Council), Cllr J Seymour (Telford and Wrekin Council), Liz Noakes (Telford and Wrekin Council), J Chaplin (Healthwatch Telford and Wrekin), Cllr P Watling, (Telford and Wrekin Council), D Evans (Clinical Commissioning Group) and L Johnston (Telford and Wrekin Council)

Also Present: H Onions (Consultant in Public Health), H Patel (Pharmaceutical Advisor), M Bennett (Head of Commissioning, Integrated Care), L Mills (Service Delivery Manager, Health Improvement), V McKay (Service Delivery Manager, Commissioning Vulnerable People) J Smith (Service Delivery Manager, Access and Assessment) S Wain (Group Specialist Commissioner) and N Morrow (Telford & Wrekin CCG Commissioner).

Officers: M Cumberbatch (Legal Services) J Power (Delivery & Planning Manager) and J Clarke (Democratic Services Officer).

### **HWB-31 MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – that the Minutes of the meetings of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 21<sup>st</sup> January 2015 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

### **HWB-32 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

D Wickham (NHS England Shropshire and Staffordshire Area Team), P Taylor (Telford and Wrekin Council) and Dylan Harrison (Clinical Commissioning Group)

### **HWB-33 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None

### **HWB-34 PUBLIC SPEAKING**

No members of the public had registered to speak.

### **HWB-35 PHARMACEUTICAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT 2015/16 – 2017/18**

H Onions and H Patel presented a joint report on the Pharmaceutical Needs Assessment (PNA) for 2015/16-2017/18.

The Health and Wellbeing Board had a legal duty to publish a revised PNA by 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015. The draft Telford & Wrekin PNA had been developed in line with national guidance and expectations and best practice.

A 60 day consultation period had taken place with statutory consultees, with the responses and suggestions being taken on board and used to develop the PNA going forward.

The Board discussed the report and Cllr P Watling raised the lack of provision of out of hours services in South Telford and no pharmacy was open until 11pm as there were in other areas of Telford. It was also asked if there had been any feedback regarding this during the consultation and if this was an issue with service users?

A public survey had taken place but nothing specific had been raised within the consultation and there was significant provision elsewhere. This had not been raised through the JSNA. H Patel suggested that a bespoke piece of work regarding the provisions within South Telford could be undertaken.

Cllr J Seymour raised concerns regarding the lack of provision of pharmacies within the rural area and felt that this was not being addressed. Large areas of the rural community were outside of the 1.6 mile distance to a GP dispensary. She also felt that the survey that was circulated did not cover the rural areas. It was further felt that the "over-the-border" provision did not meet the criteria as this was also the rural area.

H Patel expressed that it was very difficult to encourage pharmacies to set up in the rural area and operate as a business as it may not be commercially viable. There were 100 hour delivery & collection services offered by dispensing practices to the rural areas. Patients often had to pass a pharmacy when travelling in to use GP services. A repeat prescription collection and delivery service was also available.

Cllr J Seymour commented on Appendix VII of the report regarding the take up of enhanced and advanced commissioned services. She asked if the pharmacies were pro-active in taking up these services as these services gave a lot of scope for expansion of the business or were they prevented due to constraints and costs?

H Patel confirmed that pharmacies were paid by activity and some pharmacies had become Healthy Living Pharmacies and giving advice on services such as healthy eating and exercise advice. The pharmacies were only paid for the activity and not for the business being there. Dispensing, the treatment of chronic illness and prevention of illness needed to be addressed through the JSNA and the provision of services needed to be less confusing to the public. There was also a need for the provision of health checks for those patients who could not access GP Practices. H Onions confirmed that they were looking at expanding out practices to make them more comprehensive. H Patel confirmed that NHS England supported the services within GP Practices and dispensaries but they were working towards getting the practices more involved with the items marked yellow on Appendix VII. The core role of the services was to give a safe supply of medicine and this was paramount, but if there was capacity to extend and add on services this would be encouraged. Emergency contraception services needed to be more uniform for patients and order that they were not confused with what was on offer. There was currently a push to consolidate the services, but this needed to go hand in hand with high standards and be a comprehensive service.

L Noakes commented regarding the lack of out of hours and weekend services within South Telford and suggested that an impact assessment was undertaken as there was an issue with equity. South Telford was an area with less car ownership and this may be an area to be picked up during the 18 month review. The Report was a comprehensive document and did describe the offer that pharmacies could make and this needed to be communicated to the public and all partners needed to work together to make this happen.

H Patel discussed communication and suggested that community pharmacies had a role to play within this area.

Cllr G Green referred to page 18 of the Report showing that there were no pharmacy services after 6pm and no services on a Sunday. One in three people in this area were without a car. There were further issues with mobility and there were a large number of over 65s and over 85s. Cllr Green was of the opinion that the deferral to review the service until 18 months' time was too long to wait.

H Patel confirmed that a bespoke piece of work regarding the offer in South Telford would be undertaken during the next 6 months.

Cllr E Clare asked what controls were in place over pharmacies purchasing the types/brands of medicines in order to keep them standardised.

H Patel explained that medicines were a difficult area. Pharmacies were sent medicines by wholesalers under a generic name and the pharmacies had no control on what brand of medicine the wholesalers sent. NHS England did not have a great deal of control of this area except for the quality control and safety of the medicines dispensed.

D Evans referred to page 23 and 24 of the report and explained the pressures on services. Access to acute care was very important to the public and was also important with regard to Futurefit.

J Chaplin informed the Board that Healthwatch were happy to continue to provide the view of the public. With regard to the supply of medicines held by pharmacies how could issues regarding the elderly and infirm be addressed.

H Patel confirmed currently Care Plans were not available to GP Practices or pharmacies although they did have access to the medicines required by patients. There were home medicine reviews and collection and delivery of medication services available to the public.

H Onions confirmed that this work all connected into the Futurefit programme and included the PNA.

M Innes confirmed that there was a need for shared information across health and social care services in order to better care for the population and this was the opportunity for the Health and Wellbeing Board to drive this forward and it was asked if there was a piece of work the Board could do around this area?

Cllr E Clare asked if the pharmacies were paid for providing the medicine review service and commented that the public may prefer to talk to the doctor rather than the pharmacy as the doctor had prescribed the medicine.

H Patel informed the Board that the pharmacies were taking a holistic approach and asking patients if they knew how to take the medicine, how to use the medicine and with regard to inhalers checking that patients were using them correctly. The pharmacies were also looking at waste medicines and the over-ordering of medicines. The budget for this work was already included within the pharmacy budgets it was just being used in a different way.

Cllr J Seymour commented that she supported the new pharmacy specific interviews with regard to new medicines. Cllr Seymour asked whether any pharmacy currently offered stop smoking services or if there would be no services in place until the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015?

H Onions confirmed to the Board that there would be new providers of stop smoking services from April 2015 but that there were currently no services available within pharmacies.

Cllr Seymour asked if it was up to individual pharmacies to ask to take up these services?

H Onions confirmed that all pharmacies would be contacted with regards to the supply of services.

Cllr Seymour asked about emergency prescriptions and the supply of emergency medicines.

H Patel informed the Board that there was a provision for the supply of emergency medicine. The public used ShropDoc and A&E services in order to access emergency medicines but it was hoped that pharmacies could be encouraged to use this provision. There were concerns about the misuse of medicines but the pharmacies would feed back the information to the GP Practice to inform them that emergency medicines had been supplied.

Cllr Seymour further asked if this was only for specific medication and if this was illegal?

H Patel confirmed that this was not illegal, it was a private transaction and that the public would have to pay for this service as it was not an NHS Service.

Cllr Seymour suggested that the points raised by the Board be included within the final document.

H Onions said that there would be changes to the PNA and the suggestions made would be incorporated with the changes.

The Chair referred to the recommendations and asked the Board if they consider that they had read the report, fully taken part in a debate and give the responses careful consideration and if there were any amendments required to the recommendations.

H Onions informed the Board that they would be in a very weak position if the PNA was not adopted by the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015 but recommended that an urgent review took place within 6 months.

M Cumberbatch advised that the Board must be happy with the summary that the report authors had given and from P8 – 1.6 with the body of the report. If the Board members were content with the changes proposed by the report authors, then they could decide that the final amended version be signed off by the Chair.

#### **RESOLVED – that**

- a) the PNA process had been undertaken in line with the national expectations and that associated statutory duties for the HWB be noted;**
- b) the content of the PNA Equalities Impact Assessment and remedial actions set out to reduce the negative impacts identified be agreed;**
- c) all consultation responses received from both the statutory consultees and the wider respondents be considered;**
- d) the draft Telford and Wrekin Pharmaceutical Needs Assessment 2015/16-2017/18, subject to any amendments recommended in the report, which were**

**appropriate in consideration of the consultation responses, be adopted and that the Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board be authorised to approve and sign off the final amended version for publishing;**

- e) An equity review of the provision within South Telford be undertaken and reported back to HWB in September 2015.**

## **HWB-36      LOCAL AUTHORITY COMMISSIONING INTENTIONS**

L Mills and V McKay gave a brief summary of the report which provided information around the local authority commissioning intentions for public health, universal whole population and vulnerable children, young people and adults.

Appendix 4 to the Report detailed the Procurement Plan and set out the detail relating to the allocations, timescales and outcomes together with desired outcome of high level strategies.

A key area of work was the offer of early help for children, young people and families with the focus being on taking a preventative approach.

A significant development with regard to commissioning would take place from 1<sup>st</sup> October 2015 whereby the Local Authority would take over responsibility from NHS England of 0-5 year olds. The transfer would encompass the 0-5 Healthy Child Programme which included the health visiting service, Family Nurse Partnership services - a services for teenage mothers.

Stop smoking services had been discussed during the previous item.

A tender process for the clinical element of the Drug and Alcohol Recovery Service (DARS) , the alcohol counselling service and the day care services was being undertaken.

Work with General Practices was being undertaken to expand the existing provision for shared care with regard to substance misuse to increase capacity and access within the community.

With regard to children and young people it was the intention to have an outcome based commissioning approach with personalisation and prevention to close the gap for the disadvantaged.

The Care Act 2014 would have an impact regarding adults. There were now a number of statutory requirements including advocacy services and a market position statement.

The Children's SEND reforms were generally progressing well and cost improvement plans were now in place.

For children in care including foster care it was the intention to make sure good outcomes were achieved.

Safeguarding was covered within the Better Care Fund.

L Noakes commented that the purpose of the report was to ensure that the commissioning intentions were aligned with the Health and Wellbeing Strategy and were integrated in their approach.

A discussion took place including:

- the monetary values not being shown on some items in Appendix 4 to the report
- children's commissioning work was clear on the needs of young people and these were being met appropriately
- making every contact count – workforce and partner agency training
- case studies to be brought to the Board on how the improvements were beginning to take shape
- holistic approach
- voluntary sector – grants and access to funding
- joined up decision making
- Strategic Commissioning Group
- Mapping of provisions and identifying gaps in service

**RESOLVED – that the high level of commissioning principles of the Local Authority and the details proposals outlined in Appendices 2, 3 and 4 be noted and endorsed.**

**HWB-37      NHS TELFORD AND WREKIN CCG STRATEGIC COMMISSIONING INTENTIONS 2015/16**

D Evans presented a report on the commissioning intentions for NHS Telford and Wrekin CCG for 2015/16.

From 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015 the CCG would be responsible for Primary Care Commissioning. This had not currently been looked at within the report and a paper would be brought back to the Board in due course. The vast majority of the commissioning work related to GMS Services and general practice services. The Local enhanced services would also need to be looked at with regard to the ring fenced monies.

It was important to make sure that the NHS Constitution was being met and included:

- A&E
- Elective Care
- Dementia
- IAX

Constraints gave a clear planning framework and this had to be adhered to.

An electronic format of the document would be circulated to the Board.

Cllr P Watling asked if the Better Care Fund (BCF) had been given a delivery value and if the budget had been agreed?

D Evans replied that the budget for the BCF had been agreed but that it had challenges with regards to acute providers being signed up to the agreement and this needed to be rectified. It would be necessary to take money from the acute budget and put this into the BCF. An invitation had been given to SaTH for a £3m contract variation. This was a global amount that sat with SaTH and a reduction in the contract would cause the contract to be varied and money released out of the current contract.

A discussion took place with regard to the voluntary sector, it's importance in supporting the sustainability of the health and social care system. D Evans outlined how the CCG had undertaken a process of awarding grants to the voluntary sector recently. He understood that this had not reduced the overall investment into the voluntary sector from the CCG but agreed to confirm if there had been a reduction of funding from the CCG to the third sector to this Board.

L Noakes suggested that the Board would be very interested in working with the CCG and seeing a Primary Care Strategy now the CCG had responsibility for commissioning General Practices.

A discussion took place including:

- Public Health budget
- 7 day working
- End of Life Plan
- Integrated Care

Following the discussion a suggestion was put forward to amend the recommendation to read:

“To consider the contents of the Commissioning Intentions for 2015/16 and ensure that they are aligned to those of the wider Health and Social Care plans.”

**RESOLVED – that the contents of the Commissioning Intentions for 2015/16 are aligned to those of the wider Health and Social Care plans.**

**HWB-38 BETTER CARE FUND: DEVELOPMENT OF THE SECTION 75 PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT**

M Bennett and V McKay presented a report on the Better Care Fund and the development of the S75 Partnership Agreement.

From April 2015 there would be a single Agreement and a single pooled budget for the Better Care Fund (BCF). The agreement would represent the new ways of working between the two authorities and partner organisations with the Health and Wellbeing Board having oversight of these arrangements.

The template for the S75 Agreement was currently being worked through by NHS England and Bevan Brittain (Legal Advisors). A Pooled Budget Monitoring Group was being mandated to work through other services and the Community Trusts in order to look at the pooled budget. The risks of such an agreement were understood and monitoring and governance arrangements had been arranged and this work should be completed by the end of March 2015.

The Schedules and agreements were currently being worked on.

A discussion took place including:

- Pooled Budget Monitoring and the difficulties surrounding this. Michael Bennett confirmed that there would be a report back to this Board concerning the pooled budget work
- Template agreement
- Schedules and monitoring

It was expected that the date of implementation would be 1<sup>st</sup> April 2015.

**RESOLVED** – that

- a) **the progress which had taken place to development a Section 75 Partnership Agreement be noted;**
- b) **the arrangements of the Section 75 Partnership Agreement over the coming year be overseen.**

**HWB-39      PRIORITY UPDATE: MENTAL HEALTH AND WELLBEING – COMMISSIONING STRATEGY UPDATE**

S Wain and N Morrow presented a report on the Mental Health and Wellbeing – Commissioning Strategy.

Cllr A England asked how Telford and Wrekin would join up with the Foundation Trust. Cllr England felt that he would only be consulted a Lead Member for Mental Health and not be consulted as a governor of the Trust. He wanted to ensure that there was a strong consultation process including the foundation of the Trust.

N Morrow explained that engagement had taken place with the Foundation Trust so far regarding developments, conditions and outcomes.

Cllr J Seymour endorsed the consultation from users, their families, carers and members of the public who wanted mental health services to be responsive and have a real grasp of the needs of the local community.

S Wain informed the Board that there was a related piece of work was currently being undertaken with providers and the voluntary sector.

M Innes hoped that some views with regard to Mental Health could be normalised. The Telford and Wrekin CCG were lead Commissioners with regard to the health economy and were engaging with Shropshire to represent their views and take into account any similar needs and expectations.

S Wain informed the Board that a Crisis Concordat county-wide piece of work was being undertaken in order to pull together a joint action plan for crisis care between Telford and Wrekin and Shropshire and planning a joint contract negotiation and management.

L Noakes welcomed the development of the Strategy and stressed the need to take a holistic view with regard to physical health, affected mental health and people with severe mental health conditions who had significantly poorer physical health and lower life expectancy and felt that the draft Strategy should be brought back to the Board in September not December.

L Johnston welcomed the report especially with regard to children and that engagement would obtain diverse views in order to put service provisions in place. Improvements could be made to benefit transition arrangements which were currently a cause for concern.

J Tozer gave his concerns regarding the timing of the engagement and that the Police and other partners were keen to give their views but had not been listed as consultees and

sought clarification if their views would be sought. He felt that the county-wide approach was very important.

J Chaplin confirmed that Healthwatch had already been involved in the consultation process and were happy to continue to have an input and to work closely with the process and contribute to the writing of strategies.

D Evans informed the Board that the CCG Board had made a commitment, through the executive team, regarding the transitions for those with mental health, disabilities and long term conditions. The transition stage following an 18<sup>th</sup> birthday meant that the service user would have to deal with a complete set of new people within the health and social care environment. This service was currently disjointed and let down, children, their families and carers.

The Chair spoke of the lack of mental health services within Telford and Wrekin following the closure of Castle Lodge. The Redwood Centre was now open but this was not a local service and Telford was in need of a local Hub.

D Evans explained that the CCG were mindful of the situation it was proposed that a report be brought back to a future meeting of the Board and it was suggested that this would be during the Summer.

Following the discussion it was

**RESOLVED** – that

**(a) the approach outlined in the Report be endorsed; and**

**(b) a programme of engagement be confirmed and for the Chair to have delegated authority to sign off the programme.**

**(c) The draft mental health strategy be considered by the Board in September 2015**

**HWB-40      PRIORITY UPDATE SUPPORT PEOPLE TO LIVE INDEPENDENTLY**

L Thorogood and J Smith presented a report on the Health and Wellbeing Priority – Supporting People to Live Independently.

The focus of the report was to align the priorities but to be mindful of the critical elements of the Care Act 2014 (“the Act”) being compliance and responding to the current financial climate.

The draft Wellbeing and Prevention Strategy was attached at Appendix 1 to the report and set out the local approach to promoting wellbeing and independence across the continuum of need.

Appendix 2 and 3 of the report contained The Adult Social Care – Right help, Right time to Promote Independence – Commitment Statement 2015-2016 and the Adult Social Services Information and Advice Strategy 2015-2018.

The Prevention Strategy was in line with the principles of outcomes based commissioning.

Following consultation in December 2014 it was the intention to make a change in direction of Telford and Wrekin's Commissioning intentions in order to undertake as much as possible within the local community and to support people to live independently. The Commissioning and Operational Teams would work closely in order to move the strategy forward and comply with the duties and principles of the Care Act. A 3 week project was currently being undertaken looking into prevention within the community.

L Johnston confirmed that in terms of strategies and commissioning intentions and outcomes that the achievement of a personalised approach would be reviewed in order to see what was currently available and how improvements could be made before proceeding with an all-age approach. Community based solutions were reducing delay and dependence on services. It was also hoped that the promotion of assisted funding to keep people in their homes would be supported by domiciliary care and assisted help.

Cllr J Seymour welcomed the report but noted the risks which lay in the short term and how resources were shifted from the high costs services to support a preventative approach. It was fundamental to support this process or the BCF would not happen.

Cllr A England commented that the report led back to working with the voluntary sector. He also asked if discussions could take place with associations such as the Armed Forces Veterans and SAFA to see if they could help to support service users rather than the Local Authority.

J Smith informed the Board that an asset-based social work system was the way forward. Services users were unaware of the local services but better communication around what was out there would help to grow services.

All of the comments from the HWB meeting would be fed back to P Taylor for the Care Act Board.

**RESOLVED – that**

- (a) the update and progress since the last Board report on this priority be noted;**
- (b) feedback and comments on the draft proposed documents being**
  - i. Wellbeing and Prevention Strategy (Appendix 1)**
  - ii. Adult Social Care Commitment (Appendix 2)**
  - iii. Information and Advice Strategy (Appendix 3)**

**as part of the wider consultation process be provided.**

**HWB-41     NHS FUTUREFIT PROGRAMME REPORT**

D Evans gave a brief overview of the report on the NHS Futurefit programme.

The report gave details of the shortlisting which had taken place and which had been to the CCG and Trust Boards. An Evaluation Panel had been established which had looked at the long list and had narrowed this down to a short list which was currently being considered and included:

- Emergency Centre (EC) and Diagnostic & Treatment Centre (DTC) on a New site;
- EC on a New site, DTC at Princess Royal Hospital (PRH)

- EC on a New site, DTC at Royal Shrewsbury Hospital (RSH)
- EC at PRH, DTC at RSH
- EC at RSH, DTC at PRH
- Do minimum (existing dual site acute services maintained, provider and commissioner efficiency strategies implemented but no major services change).

M Innes commented that Urgent Care Centres (UCC) included an acute provision and would remain in Shrewsbury and Telford.

D Evans further commented that these UCCs were likely to be prototyped and repeated elsewhere.

L Noakes asked if confirmation could be given to the Board, similarly to that given to the CCG Board, that if the new build was no longer a viable option financially that further options from the long-list would then be considered.

D Evans commented that if any option dropped out as being unaffordable and this affected only 1 option on the short list then this was likely to continue. If, however, more than 1 of the options were affected then the short list would have to be reconsidered.

L Noakes confirmed that 3 of the short-listed options did include a new build and that this would ultimately affect the short list leaving very few options.

D Evans confirmed that if this was the case then they would revert back to the long list.

A discussion took place including:

- Evaluation Panel
- The ranking of the current short list options
- Affordability of the short list options
- The weighting of the options

M Innes informed the Board that the testing of the affordability of each option was done in its own right.

D Evans further commented that each option outlined its own business case which showed both financial impact and non-financial impacts and benefits. It would not be possible to put forward an unaffordable option.

Further discussions took place including:

- The shortlisting of the 6 options
- Critical Care Units and agreed extra facilities
- Urgent Care Centres

D Evans informed the Board that it had always been the intention of the Programme Board to consider having Urgent Care Centres in both Shrewsbury and Telford and Wrekin. However, the opening hours and other basic information was still to be considered and the core offer although viability of services to the rural settings needed more work.

Following the drawing up of the short list the money and affordability aspects were being looked at further which included both the capital and revenue context.

M Innes confirmed the system of approach was a “bottom up” design and that the affordability was tested initially and once this had been established the quality of the offer was considered.

Cllr A England asked the Board to note that Telford and Wrekin Council had always demanded that there was 24 hour A&E provision for the Borough.

L Noakes discussed the weighting procedure and the process that would now be followed and suggested that the Treasury determine a higher weighting for affordability that as was the case at the shortlisting stage.

D Evans confirmed that neither of the CCGs would sign up to build something that was unaffordable.

**RESOLVED** – that the report be noted.

**HWB-42      CHILDREN, YOUNG PEOPLE & FAMILIES BOARD PROGRESS UPDATE**  
**(2014/15)**

L Johnston presented the report on the Children, Young People and Families Board.

The Board had now been in existence for 4 years and this report had focussed their priorities and now had 5 strategic priorities which were:

- Early Help
- Strengthening Families
- Children in Care
- Aiming High for Disabled Children
- Achievement for All

One of the key priorities within these areas was teenage pregnancy.

The report was welcomed by the Board and a discussion took place which included:

- Early Health’s clear strategy and prevention to reduce the need for services later
- The use of proactive link to re-shape the Youth Service with a targeted approach
- Positive issues around prevention work
- Government criteria in reducing exclusions

The Board raised concerns regarding the homelessness rates for 16 and 17 year olds which had jumped to 77.5%

L Johnston confirmed that the Council were currently looking at these issues and that a “step up and step down” facility at Dodmoor would help to provide support to young people and this area of work was also being driven forward by the Homelessness Partnership in conjunction with the Community Safety Partnership.

Cllr J Seymour asked if the pregnancy rates for 15-17 year olds included those teenagers who were married.

L Noakes confirmed to the Board that the figures were calculated regardless of marital status. She also confirmed to the Board that whilst the numbers had fallen up to 2013 but not as fast as nationally. An action plan was being drawn up to look at this area.

**RESOLVED** – that

- (a) the progress made against the priorities Children, Young People and Families Board strategic priorities and the Health and Wellbeing Board’s Priority “Reducing Teenage Pregnancy” be considered; and**
- (b) specific areas where greater focus/improvement should be sought by the Board and identified.**

The meeting ended at 4.11pm

Chairman:

Date:

## **LICENSING COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of a meeting of the Licensing Committee held on Tuesday  
24<sup>th</sup> March 2015 at 6.00 pm at Addenbrooke House, Ironmasters Way, Telford**

### **PRESENT**

Councillors C Mason (Chair), L Murray, J Seymour, R Sloan (substitute for A Mackenzie), B J Thompson and C Turley

Officers in attendance: L Noakes (Assistant Director: Health, Wellbeing and Public Protection), N. Minshall (Service Delivery Manager: Public Protection), L Fletcher (Public Protection Manager), S Fisher (Principal Licensing Officer), C Phillips (Licensing Technical Officer), T Street (Solicitor) and P Smith (Democratic Services Team Leader)

### **LC-5        MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – that the minutes of the Licensing Committee meeting held on 9 July 2014 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

### **LC-6        APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Councillors A Mackenzie and R Scammell

### **LC-7        DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

### **LC-8        STREET TRADING CONSENT POLICY AND CONDITIONS**

The Licensing Technical Officer presented the report of the Service Delivery Manager – Public Protection, which outlined a proposal to amend the current Policy and Conditions in respect of Street Trading Consents, subject to an eight week consultation period with affected bodies.

The current Policy and Conditions applicable to street trading were reviewed in early 2014, which resulted in the introduction of street trading day consents in addition to the full year consents. The cost of a day consent (for a period up to 7 days) was agreed at £60 for the first day and £18 for each additional day. The Licensing Service had since received concerns from event organisers about the prohibitive cost of the day consents, given that each commercial trader at the event was required to apply for a consent. It had been suggested that an ‘umbrella’ consent could be introduced to cover a number of commercial traders at one event. Following discussions with local event organisers, it was proposed that such an ‘umbrella’ consent would consist of a day consent for up to five commercial traders limited to one specific event. It was considered that there would still be a demand for day consents from individual traders, and this option should continue to be offered.

Appendix 1 of the report identified revisions to the existing Conditions, along with the addition of some new conditions in order to reflect the proposed changes and to provide clarification of existing conditions. New conditions were proposed in relation to requirements for wash hand facilities and a temperature probe to ensure correct food temperatures were maintained. Guidance notes for applicants had also been modified and were attached to the report, along with a Community Impact Assessment.

It was proposed to undertake an 8 week consultation exercise on the proposed changes to the Policy and Conditions with all current licensed street traders in the Borough and other interested bodies/organisations. Consultation responses would be considered by the Licensing Service in association with the Chair, and any significant comments would be brought back to the Committee.

During the ensuing discussion on the proposed 'umbrella' consent, a question was asked about how the Council could ensure that each of the traders covered under such a consent met the conditions. The Licensing Technical Officer advised that the application process would be the same, with the necessary certificates/checks being required for each trader. It was accepted that the process could take longer, and therefore any applications for an 'umbrella' consent would have to be submitted at least 14 days before an event. Members referred to the potential extra costs and Licensing Officer time in processing 'umbrella' consent applications, and asked how the figure of up to 5 commercial traders had been determined. The Service Delivery Manager: Public Protection and the Licensing Technical Officer stated that there would be a different fee structure for 'umbrella' consents that would reflect the need for additional checking etc. The number of potential street traders operating under an 'umbrella' consent had been based on the optimum cost recovery basis – any more would be prohibitive for organisers. However, costs arising from environmental/trading standards checks of traders could not be recouped through the licensing process.

Members broadly welcomed the proposal for an 'umbrella' consent which would help to make local events more cost effective, and simpler to organise. It was suggested that if adopted following the consultation period, the new consent should be reviewed after a few months operation.

**RESOLVED -**

- (a) that the amendments to the Street Trading Consent Policy and Conditions, as set out in the report and appendices, be approved for consultation for an eight week period.**
- (b) that authority be delegated to the Principal Licensing Officer, in consultation with the Chair, to consider and determine the results of the consultation, subject to any significant comments being brought back to Licensing Committee for consideration.**

## **LC-9            LICENCE FEES REVIEW**

The Principal Licensing Officer presented the report of the Service Delivery Manager – Public Protection, which detailed the proposed level of fees and charges for 2015/16 for Hackney Carriages, the Private Hire trade, Gambling and General Licences.

The current level of licence fees was implemented on 1 May 2014. In reviewing the level of fees and charges, the Committee needed take account of the need to recover the costs of administering licences so as not to subsidise the service area to the detriment of front line services, but at the same time to have regard to the impact that any increase might have upon the livelihood of licence holders. The licence fees had been reviewed in conjunction with an analysis of the costs of administering the licensing service. Appended to the report was a table showing the current and proposed new licence fees. The table also showed the projected cost recovery for each licence for the 2015/16 financial year, with the proposed licence fees largely corresponding with the cost recovery figure. A couple of minor typographical errors in the Gambling Licences fees were amended, and there was a missing line for new Sex Establishment licence applications – the figures for this were current licence fee £3000, cost recovery for 2015/16 £1161, proposed 2015/16 fee £1161. The fees and charges had been benchmarked against several other local authorities, and this information had been appended to the report and displayed at the meeting. A Community Impact Assessment had been carried out, and was appended to the report.

In response to a question about the costs that the Council could recover, the Principal Licensing Officer advised that the administrative cost of processing and issuing a licence could be recouped, but that enforcement costs for taxi licensing could not be recovered through the fees charged to licensees. A question was asked about the proposed increase in the cost of the street knowledge repeat test for taxi drivers from £10 to £128. The Service Delivery Manager – Public Protection responded that the driver training element of the licensing process was being taken out of the fee charged, so that effectively the first street knowledge test would be free. If an applicant needed to re-take the test, the £128 fee was based on the cost of administering the test. A further question was asked about the increase in cost for a performing animal registration and what checks were made on such animals, to which the Principal Licensing Officer advised that checks were done before the licence was issued, but there were no regular planned follow-up checks unless information was received from the public. Concern was also raised at the increase in fees for riding establishments given the pressures facing small businesses. The Service Delivery Manager – Public Protection stated that such establishments had to be visited by an Officer and the cost of administering this particular licence was reflected in the proposed fee.

Members acknowledged that there were significant variations in the cost of some licences, but were satisfied that the costs of administering and issuing the licences had been rigorously assessed and that the proposed fees now more accurately reflected these costs. It was noted that income targets and the administrative costs of the licences would continue to be monitored to ensure that an efficient and effective service was being provided.

**RESOLVED** - that the level of proposed fees, as shown at Appendix A of the report as amended, be approved to come into force on 1 June 2015, subject to any consultation responses received.

The meeting closed at 7.00pm.

Chairman: .....

Date: .....

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 25<sup>th</sup> February 2015 at 5.00pm in the Telford Suite at Shropshire College Hotel School Ltd (The Telford Whitehouse Hotel), Watling Street, Wellington, Telford TF1 2NJ**

**PRESENT:** Councillors J C Minor (Chair), N G Dugmore, I T W Fletcher (substitute for E J Greenaway), R T Kiernan, J Loveridge, A A Mackenzie (as substitute for A S Jhawar), L A Murray, B J Thompson (as substitute for K R Guy) and C R Turley.

**ALSO PRESENT:** Councillors S P Burrell (for Planning Application TWC/2014/1080), K T Blundell and W L Tomlinson (for Planning Application TWC/2014/0746), C R P Mollett (for Planning Application TWC/2014/0998), V A Fletcher (for Planning Application TWC/2014/0656) and P R Watling (for Planning Applications TWC/2014/0844 and TWC/2014/0845)

#### **PC-074      MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 4 February 2015 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman, subject to the inclusion of a further declaration of interest at minute PC-067 to show that with regard to planning application TWC/2014/1012 Councillor B J Thompson advised that he was a member of Wrockwardine Wood & Trench Parish Council but had not been involved in any discussions on this application.

#### **PC-075      APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Councillors E J Greenaway, K R Guy and A S Jhawar.

#### **PC-076      DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

With regard to planning application TWC/2014/1122 Councillor C R Turley advised that he was a local ward member and member of Hollinswood & Randlay Parish Council but had not been involved in any discussions on this application.

With regard to planning application TWC/2014/0671, Councillor C R Turley advised that he was a member of Great Dawley Town Council but had not been involved in any discussions on this application.

With regard to planning application TWC/2014/0656, Councillor I T W Fletcher advised that he was a local ward member and member of St Georges & Priorslee Parish Council but had not been involved in any discussion on this application.

With regard to planning application TWC/2014/0998, Mr M Barker, Assistant Director: Planning Specialist, advised that he was a resident living close to the application site and would withdraw from the meeting during consideration of that application.

**PC-077      DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS**

None.

**PC-078      SITE VISITS**

**RESOLVED** – that site visits take place in respect of the following planning applications on Wednesday, 18 March 2015:-

- TWC/2014/0980 - Priorslee ; and
- TWC/2014/1054 – 1 Moorhead, Preston upon-the-Weald Moors

**PC-079      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 each planning application.

- (a)            TWC/2014/1080 - Land south and west of Tibberton Motor Repairs, Mill Lane, Tibberton, Newport, Shropshire

This was an outline application for residential development (up to 22 houses) and construction of a modified vehicular access, with associated highways and drainage infrastructure and other accommodation works with all other matters reserved. The application site (1.18ha) was located on the northern edge of Tibberton, with a small car workshop at the northern end of the site. Due to past uses of the site, it was considered that parts of it could be characterised as brownfield land. An update report was tabled at the meeting which contained further comments submitted from local residents that did not give cause to any change in the recommendations from Officers. Members had undertaken a site visit earlier in the afternoon prior to the meeting.

Councillor E Ashcroft, member of Tibberton & Cherrington Parish Council, addressed the Committee. The Parish Council had objected to this application, and Councillor Ashcroft made particular reference to the proximity of the River Meese to the application site. This was a substantial, fast-flowing watercourse that would constitute a significant safety risk if houses were built here. There was also a flood risk, and this site had flooded in the past. Priority should be given to residents' safety. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) advised that residential development should not be built on areas at risk of flooding. He also referred to the dangers of allowing more traffic along Mill Lane, which was a narrow road hazardous to pedestrians.

Councillor S P Burrell, Borough Ward Member, addressed the Committee, and stated that the Committee needed to fully consider the impact that this application would have on the infrastructure of the village. The current drainage, highways and communications infrastructure was already under pressure, as were places at the local primary school. It was noted that the Committee had originally refused a previous application for residential development in Tibberton partly due to the lack of sustainable infrastructure, and that these issues had also prevented sites in the

locality that had been approved from progressing beyond consent stage. He asked for the application to be deferred for re-consideration.

Ms J Bleach addressed the Committee on behalf of the residents of a property adjoining the site. This property (Croft Cottage) was seen as the “stopping edge” of the village, and this application site was beyond that. The site was in a valley floor, and would be very visible from higher ground. More detail was required as to what the impact of this development would have on the landscape. Reference was also made to the flood risk.

Mr A Williams, the applicant’s agent, addressed the Committee and stated that this was part brownfield land. It was not in the recognised flood plain of the River Meese, and there was no objection from the Environment Agency in terms of flood risk. There were no objections from the Highways Authority, and it was contended that the objection from the residents of the adjoining property was about loss of view, which was not a material planning consideration. It was considered that the application was in accordance with the NPPF and the LPA’s policies. It was a modest development in scale, and would be delivered.

The Planning Officer advised on the principle of development, and the absence of a demonstrable 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites and the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework for a presumption in favour of sustainable development. He also drew attention to aspects of the report relating to scale of development, design considerations, the relationship between the site and adjoining properties, highways, drainage and flooding and impact on other infrastructure. In terms of the refusal for a development of 60 dwellings on land adjacent to 12 Tibberton, this proposal was manifestly different to that site in a number of ways. The fact that other sites in the area had been approved or were for sale did not justify withholding planning permission. Financial contributions to improving the access and visibility of the local road infrastructure, as well as for local education and recreation provision, were being sought through a Section 106 Agreement. The application was considered to comply with relevant national and local planning policies, and was recommended for approval subject to financial contributions, affordable housing provision and appropriate conditions. Members were asked to disregard paragraph c) of the recommendation which had been included in error.

Reference was made to the Committee’s visit to the site, with some Members expressing the view that this was not an appropriate place for development and that the Environment Agency’s comments that there was no flood risk were contradicted by evidence from local people. Other Members were of the view that the advice and views of the statutory consultees and the Council’s professional officers should be respected, and that any concerns could be addressed through appropriate conditioning. In relation to the location of the site next to a river course, the Assistant Director: Planning Specialist advised that there were a number of examples of successful riverside developments in other parts of the Borough.

It was moved and seconded that the recommendations in the report be approved. On being put to the vote, it was:-

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/1080 authority be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant outline planning permission subject to the applicant entering into a section 106 legal agreement with the Local Planning Authority (terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager) in order to secure:

- The provision of 40% on site affordable housing;
- A contribution of up to £115,146 towards primary and secondary education;
- A payment of up to £41,800 for local transport infrastructure;
- A payment of up to £13,200 towards the enhancement of local play and recreational space locally;
- A payment of £5,000 for financial management and monitoring of the legal agreement;

**and to the conditions set out in the report.**

(b) TWC/2014/1122 – Land at junction of Stirchley Avenue/Randlay Avenue, Randlay, Telford

This was a full application for the erection of 31 dwellings with associated parking, access and landscaping. The application site was just under 1ha in size and currently comprised hard surfacing associated with the former Randlay Lorry Park. It also contained a number of largely scrub trees, but was classified as brownfield land. The proposed houses would be a mix of two and three bed semi-detached units for private (market) rent. These formed part of the Council's Housing Investment Programme (HIP) that was intended to deliver over 400 new homes at various sites in the Borough, thereby providing much needed high quality rented accommodation. Although no affordable housing had been put forward for this application, the HIP as a whole would generate affordable housing provision of 17%, which was considered acceptable taking into account overall viability of the various sites.

The Planning Officer advised on the principle of development including loss of part of the site as an employment site, highways impacts, design considerations and affordable housing and Section 106 requirements. There had been no objections to the application, although the Parish Council had raised concerns regarding parking issues once the lorry park was lost for informal parking. It was considered that the proposed development was in a highly sustainable location, was accessible to local services and the Town Centre, was of an acceptable design and layout, and would cause no harm to nearby residential amenity. It was therefore recommended for approval subject to a prior memorandum for financial contributions and appropriate conditions.

In response to Member questions about the proposed CTAAP highway contribution, the Highways Manager reported that this had been reviewed, and a revised figure of £17,403 was now proposed. The Planning Officer added that while the site was just outside the Town Centre area, it would generate additional trips to and from the Centre. Members welcomed the proposal for more rented homes, and noted the

undertaking that affordable housing would be provided at other sites within the overall Housing Investment Programme.

It was therefore moved and seconded that the recommendation in the report be approved. On being put to the vote, it was:-

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/1122 planning permission be approved, subject to the completion of a prior Memorandum to include the making of financial contributions of £17,403 for Highways, £40,069 for education provision, £2,000 for planning and financial monitoring and £1200 for Travel Plan monitoring; and the conditions set out in the report, with authority delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to amend and add appropriately worded conditions.

(c) TWC/2014/1124 – Former Woodlands Primary School, Ironbridge Road, Madeley, Telford

This was a full application for the erection of 101 dwellings with associated parking, access and landscaping. The application site was located at the former Woodlands Primary School site, consisting of approximately 2.65ha within a predominately residential area. The proposed houses would be a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced units for private (market) rent. These formed part of the Council's Housing Investment Programme (HIP) that was intended to deliver over 400 new homes at various sites in the Borough, thereby providing much needed high quality rented accommodation. Although no affordable housing had been put forward for this application, the HIP as a whole would generate affordable housing provision of 17%, which was considered acceptable taking into account overall viability of the various sites.

The Planning Officer advised on the principle of development, and the absence of a demonstrable 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites and the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework for a presumption in favour of sustainable development, highways impacts, design considerations and affordable housing and Section 106 requirements. Some minor amendments to the scheme had been received, but these were acceptable to the Highways Officer. Two letters of objection had been received, and the Parish Council, while supporting the application, had made a number of comments. It was not considered that these led to any change to the recommendation from Officers. It was considered that the proposed development was in a highly sustainable location, was accessible to local services and to Madeley Centre, was of an acceptable design and layout, and would cause no harm to nearby residential amenity. It was therefore recommended for approval subject to a prior memorandum for financial contributions and appropriate conditions.

Members commented on the derelict nature of the site at present, and welcomed its development and the proposal for more rented homes. It was noted that there was an undertaking that affordable housing would be provided at other sites within the overall Housing Investment Programme.

It was therefore moved and seconded that the recommendation in the report be approved. On being put to the vote, it was:-

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/1124 planning permission be approved subject to completion of a prior Memorandum to include the making of financial contributions of £150,000 for the provision of an off-site sports pitch, £132,351 for education provision and £2,000 for planning and financial monitoring; and the conditions set out in the report, with authority delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to amend and add appropriately worded conditions.

(d) TWC/2014/0746 – Maxell Europe Ltd, Hortonwood, Telford

This was an outline application for the erection of a mixed use development comprising of up to 540no dwellings (Use Class C3), a local centre (Use Class A1), and public open space with associated access and landscaping following the demolition of the factory. All other matters were reserved at this stage. The site amounted to 24.57ha within the settlement of Apley Castle adjoining the junction of the A442 Queensway and Whitchurch Drive. Part of the site contained the large factory premises of Maxell who, having reduced the scale of their operations, had surrendered their lease and were re-locating. The current applicants had purchased the site with the intention of building a meat processing and abattoir facility, but following local opposition had sought an alternative location. The remainder of the site was in agricultural use, part of which was in the Green Network.

At the meeting on 14 January 2015, the Committee had deferred further consideration of the application for further information to be provided in relation to education provision in the local area and the impact on the existing road network. Included in this report were statements from the Schools Organisation Service and the Local Highways Authority in response to the comments of Members at the earlier meeting. Update reports were tabled at the meeting which contained a further submission from the Friends of Apley Woods, a further Ecology Report from the applicants and a response from Council Officers, and further representations from the applicant's agent. The second update report also contained a slightly amended recommendation. Members had undertaken a site visit prior to the 14 January meeting.

Councillor K T Blundell, Borough Ward member, addressed the Committee. She did not accept the statement from the Schools Organisation Service that there were sufficient school places in the immediate area, and questioned the figures that had been quoted. The distances to schools further away were not viable or safe for walking, and so inevitably there would be more traffic generated to get children to and from school. The local road network was already at capacity, and she was not reassured from the evidence provided by Highways Officers that the extra vehicles arising from this development could be accommodated, and that there would not be a serious adverse impact on access to the nearby Princess Royal Hospital. This was not a sustainable development, and the application could not be supported unless a new primary school was built and significant improvements made to the surrounding highways network.

Councillor W L Tomlinson, adjoining Borough Ward Member, addressed the Committee. He further questioned the assertion that there were sufficient school

places in the area, taking into account other housing developments that would come forward. There was an offer from the applicants to provide an area of the site for a new school, and it was felt that this should be taken up. In terms of the impact on the local road network, the issues of traffic congestion along Whitchurch Drive had not been addressed.

Mr S Warner addressed the Committee on behalf of local residents and the Friends of Apley Woods. Apley Woods was one of the key green spaces in the Borough and provided a habitat for many species, some under threat. This development placed this flora and fauna at risk. It was accepted that some development of the site was inevitable, but it needed to be sympathetic in order to minimise the impact on Apley Woods. It was considered that the density of housing proposed was too great, and there should be at least a 20% reduction along with extending the buffer zone between the development and the Woods to 30m. The concerns about the local infrastructure being able to cope with this development were repeated.

Ms K Else, the applicant's agent, addressed the Committee and stated that the applicants had sought to address the concerns raised at the previous meeting. An offer had been made to provide a site for the delivery of a new school, but the Council had advised that a financial contribution was the best way to address local education provision and need. It was considered that the proposed mitigation works to the local highway network would provide sufficient capacity, and the applicants had agreed to make contributions to the enlargement of the Shawbirch roundabout as well as a gift of land adjoining the roundabout in order to facilitate its improvement. The applicants would be seeking to avoid any damage to Apley Woods and to work with the local community in ensuring its protection.

The Planning Officer advised on the principle of development, and the absence of a demonstrable 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites and the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework for a presumption in favour of sustainable development. He also drew attention to aspects of the report relating to loss of employment land and Green Network, the principle of a new Local Centre, highway considerations, landscape and visual impact, ecology and nature conservation, outdoor recreation and open space, design, flood risk and drainage, archaeology, affordable housing and section 106 contributions. The further information provided in relation to education provision highways did not support the building of a new school on the application site, as it was not necessarily the most optimum location to serve the needs of the area. In terms of the road network, the LHA was satisfied that the level of contributions proposed as part of a Section 106 Agreement would mitigate impacts arising from this development. The application complied with relevant national and local planning policies, was considered to be an acceptable form of sustainable development, there were no technical objections, concerns over education provision and congestion of the local road network had been addressed, and therefore it was recommended for approval.

Some Members questioned the additional information that had been provided in relation to education provision in terms of the impact on existing schools in the area. The Service Delivery Manager: School Organisation explained that over time children living at this development would gain places at 'in-area' schools who currently had a high percentage of 'out of area' pupils. It was considered that 70

additional places could be created at Millbrook Primary School and there was the possibility of expansion within the primary phase at Hadley Learning Community. She also explained the rules in terms of school admission policies. In relation to further questions about the capacity of the local road network, the Highways Engineer reported that Marches LEP funding had been secured for improving a number of key junctions in the area, and this money needed to be spent by March 2017. It was not possible at the present time, and in isolation from a wider review of traffic movements in the North Telford area, to consider dualling the link roads between the roundabouts. Some Members remained unconvinced by the assurances that had been provided, and expressed concerns at the impact of increased traffic congestion on access to the Princess Royal Hospital. However, other Members noted that this was partly a brownfield site, that the design was acceptable, the issues regarding school provision and highways had been addressed, and that the Council's Ecologist was satisfied that the development would not result in the loss of wildlife habitat. It was therefore moved and seconded that the recommendation in the report be approved. On being put to the vote, it was:-

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/0746 authority be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant outline planning permission subject to the applicant entering into a section 106 legal agreement with the Local Planning Authority (terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager) in order to secure:

- A payment of £1,085,231 for primary education and £528,974 for secondary education based on no 1 bed units and 15% affordable;
- A contribution of £130,000 towards on-site provision of open space and off-site sports/leisure provision and wildlife management of Apley Wood Wildlife Site;
- A payment of £50,000 for footpath improvements around Apley Pool;
- A payment of £350,000 (not inclusive of 5% admin fee) for maintenance of Local Centre, landscaping and drainage through a management company;
- A payment of 100,000 for public art;
- A payment of £50,000 for a control crossing, £30,000 for bus shelters and £5,000 for travel plan monitoring;
- A contribution of £112,350 for land and transport network improvements at Shawbirch roundabout and £46,200 for the Leegomery junction;
- A payment of £15,000 for planning and financial monitoring;
- Provision of 15% affordable housing with a tenure split of 50:50 social rent/shared equity (or intermediate);
- Scheme of drainage to be conditioned to be submitted before each phase of reserved matters is approved and future maintenance arrangement/funding agreed.

**and to the conditions set out in the report, with authority delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to amend and add appropriately worded conditions.**

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist left the room prior to consideration of the next application.

(e) TWC/2014/0998 – Land adjacent Windermere House, Farm Lane, Horsehay, Telford

This was a full application for the erection of 13no dwellings with associated parking, access and drainage. The application site was a large field located in a residential area within the Horsehay Conservation Area. Nearby dwellings were of mixed age and type, with a Grade II listed terrace of cottages at New Row immediately to the east of the site. The site had been levelled, but there was a drop in levels between the application site and New Row terrace. The application was for 10 detached houses and a terrace of three houses, loosely grouped around a new communal open space area. An update report was tabled at the meeting which highlighted some minor revisions to the application, which had the effect of increasing the distance between the existing houses at New Row and the proposed houses. A fresh set of three dimensional perspectives that incorporated these revisions had been submitted by the applicant. The update report also contained a further submission from Dawley Hamlets Parish Council, information about a petition that had been submitted opposing the application, a summary of a further 20 letters of objection from residents, and new photographic information from local residents which was available for Members to view at the meeting. Members had undertaken a site visit earlier in the afternoon prior to the meeting.

Councillor T Cashmore, member of Dawley Hamlets Parish Council, addressed the Committee. She acknowledged that the applicant had sought to address some of the concerns of local residents, but there were still significant worries about the access arrangements, overlooking of New Row and the fact that the application site was in a Conservation Area - which should allow for protection from policies in the Local Plan. It was felt that a decision should be deferred until the applicant had submitted a full design assessment and 360 degree views.

Councillor C R P Mollett, Borough Ward Member, addressed the Committee. He noted that some amendments had been made to the scheme, but these were considered to be trivial and the development would still overshadow and overlook New Row. Some of the proposed properties were out-of-character with existing dwellings along Farm Lane and the heritage significance of the area needed to be recognised. He also referred to existing drainage and flooding problems in the area that were likely to be exacerbated, and to the dangers of additional traffic exiting Farm Lane onto a 50mph bypass.

Mr D Hopkins, a local resident, addressed the Committee, and urged the Committee to reject an inappropriate and unsympathetic development. Residents did not agree that the application was in compliance with Local Plan policies H3 and H4, and it would have a significant impact on neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light, loss of view, and changing the appearance of the area. There would be a

considerable adverse impact on the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings. Concern was expressed at the late submission of further plans/photos by the applicant, which residents considered to be incomplete and inaccurate.

Mr A Williams, the applicant's agent, addressed the Committee and stated that the applicant lived in Farm Lane and had employed a heritage consultant to advise on the development. The applicant had responded to concerns raised by the Parish Council and residents and made a number of revisions to the scheme, including increasing the distance away from New Row. The development was well within the Council's standards in terms of acceptable distance and overlooking. The site was allocated for housing, and promoted at a greater density than this proposal in both the SHLAA and the recent consultation document for 'Shaping Places'. In relation to drainage matters, the applicant would undertake additional measures that would improve the situation. Reference was made to the photographs and montages submitted by local residents, which he considered to be inaccurate.

The Planning Officer advised on the principle of development taking account of the planning history, and drew attention to aspects of the report relating to the scale and mix of development proposed, heritage and design considerations, impacts on living conditions of neighbouring residents, highways impacts, drainage and impact on infrastructure. Members were reminded on the site visit and the current boundary treatment to the rear of New Row which would be increased in height. The proposed layout and distances from adjoining properties were acceptable, the design of the development broadly respected its setting within a Conservation Area and there were no objections from the Highways Officer. In respect of the photograph montages/drawings that had been presented by both the applicant and local residents, the Planning Officer advised Members that the accuracy of these could not be confirmed and accordingly appropriate weight should be placed on them. The application complied with relevant national and local planning policies, and therefore it was recommended for approval.

Clarification was sought regarding the planning history of this site, to which the Planning Officer advised that there was an extant 7(1) consent for 6 dwellings on the site, and an application for 10 dwellings was granted in 1996/97 (although it never commenced). Some Members referred to the site visit and the slope of the land which it was felt would cause overlooking of New Row and have an unacceptable impact on the Conservation Area. It was suggested that bungalows would be more appropriate for this site. Further concerns were raised about the proposed drainage solution. The Development Management Manager stated that the Conservation Officer had advised that bungalows were not appropriate for this site, and that the revised application met the relevant tests in terms of heritage considerations. There were a number of proposed conditions to address any drainage issues.

A proposal that the application be refused due to its impact on residential amenity and on the Conservation Area was moved and seconded. On being put to the vote, the proposal was lost. Other Members noted that the principle of housing development on this site had previously been determined, and that the application was in accordance with guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework and with Local Plan policies. It was therefore moved and seconded that the recommendation in the report be approved. On being put to the vote, it was:-

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/0998 authority be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant planning permission subject to the applicant entering into a section 106 legal agreement with the Local Planning Authority (terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager) in order to secure a payment of up to £7,800 towards the enhancement of local play and recreational space locally and a payment of £500 for financial management and monitoring of the legal agreement; and the conditions set out in the report.

(f) TWC/2014/0656 – Land Adjacent to Stone House, Shifnal Road, Priorslee, Telford

This was a full application for the erection of fourteen dwellings with associated garages and parking. The application site was a parcel of land of approximately 0.59ha located on the southern edge of Priorslee between the University campus to the north and the M54 to the south. The application had been brought to Committee for approval of a proposed Section 106 Agreement for developer contributions.

Councillor V.A. Fletcher, Borough Ward Member, addressed the Committee. Shifnal Road was already a busy highway with a lot of vehicles travelling along it to and from the nearby Ricoh factory, and the university. There were also problems with on-street parking, and this development would add to potential traffic congestion. It was also asserted that there was no mains sewerage system on this side of Shifnal Road. In terms of the proposed Section 106 Agreement, it was suggested that it be amended to specify that all monies were allocated for the benefit of residents of Priorslee and for facilities in the local area.

The Planning Officer advised on the principle of development, and the absence of a demonstrable 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites and the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework for a presumption in favour of sustainable development. He also drew attention to aspects of the report relating to design and impact on existing amenities, highways, drainage, ecology/arboriculture and section 106 contributions. The principle of development on the site had been previously established, and the layout, scale and design of the proposed dwellings and associated parking was acceptable and in keeping with the surrounding area. The site was considered to be in a sustainable location, and it was therefore recommended that permission be granted subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement and subject to conditions.

In relation to on-street parking on Shifnal Road, the Planning Officer advised that a Traffic Regulation Order would be secured through a S106 contribution. In respect to drainage, there were no objections from the Council's Drainage Engineers, and it was noted that an area of the site had been retained for the installation of rainwater attenuation tanks and estate sewage treatment plant. Further to the suggestion from the Borough Ward Member, the Legal Officer advised that the wording of the Section 106 Agreement could be varied to specify that contributions were for facilities in the vicinity of the application site. The Highways Engineer advised that £3000 in the proposed Section 106 Agreement for the removal of a traffic calming feature close to

the proposed access with Shifnal Road was no longer needed as the traffic hump would be removed as part of planned resurfacing works on Shifnal Road. It was advised that this sum could be re-allocated for other community benefits within the Agreement.

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/0656 authority be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant planning permission subject to the applicant entering into a section 106 legal agreement with the Local Planning Authority (terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager) in order to secure:

- A contribution of £16,500 towards primary education facilities;
- A contribution of £9,000 towards recreation and play facilities in the vicinity;
- A contribution of £1,500 towards highway works/improvements;
- A payment of £1,500 for financial management and monitoring of the legal agreement;

and with authority delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to allocate a further £3,000 towards primary education and/or recreation and play facilities within the Agreement;

and subject to the conditions set out in the report, with authority delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to amend and add appropriately worded conditions.

(g) TWC/2014/0844 – Central Café, 32A High Street, Ironbridge, Telford

This was a full application for the creation of an external raised seating area with associated balustrade and glazing sitting at the rear of Central Café, which operated as a fish and chip restaurant and takeaway. The application was part retrospective in nature stemming from an enforcement complaint relating to an alleged unauthorised erection of a rear balcony arising from the implementation of a previous planning consent for the installation of a new shop front and creation of an elevated external seating area with balcony. It was discovered that the proposed seating area was oversized leading to an overhang over the footpath beyond the rear of the site. This application (and associated application for Listed Building Consent) was seeking to rectify the position, and plans submitted with the application confirmed that the framework would be amended on site and drawn back away from the footpath.

Councillor P R Watling, adjoining Borough Ward Member, addressed the Committee. He was speaking on behalf of local residents who had approached him while he was carrying out ward duties for the late Councillor Davies during his illness. The balcony would lead to overlooking of neighbouring properties in Severnside and loss of privacy. There was also concern about increased noise and the dropping of debris and food onto land below the development, leading to the possibility of rat infestation. The development would blight the view to and from the Iron Bridge, and may contravene Article 4 of the regulations governing World Heritage Sites.

Mr A Gayler, the applicant's agent, addressed the Committee and explained that the construction of the framework had inadvertently led to an overhang over the footpath. This application addressed any concerns raised, and had the support from a number of people with no objections from the Parish Council. The seating/dining area would be table service, and so it was not envisaged there would be a litter problem from chip papers etc.

The Planning Officer advised that the principle of development for this proposal had already been established through grant of the original consent. Officers had sought enhancements to the boundary treatment and materials proposed, and the proposed amendment was modest in form and would not have a detrimental impact on adjoining residential amenities, subject to appropriate conditions. The Officer also explained the restrictions of the Article 4 direction that removed permitted development rights from dwelling houses allowing the authority to assess such applications, but which was not relevant to this Listed Building. The application was acceptable to the Conservation Officer in terms of its impact on the character and appearance of the World Heritage Site and Severn Gorge Conservation Area.

Members considered the previous approved application in connection with existing windows on the rear elevation of the Listed Building.

**RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/0844, planning permission be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the report.**

(h) TWC/2014/0845 – Central Café, 32A High Street, Ironbridge, Telford

This was a listed building application in association with the previous application for the creation of an external raised seating area with associated balustrade and glazing sitting at the rear of Central Café, which operated as a fish and chip restaurant and takeaway. The application was part retrospective in nature stemming from an enforcement complaint relating to an alleged unauthorised erection of a rear balcony arising from the implementation of a previous planning consent for the installation of a new shop front and creation of an elevated external seating area with balcony. It was discovered that the proposed seating area was oversized leading to an overhang over the footpath beyond the rear of the site. This application was seeking to rectify the position, and plans submitted with the application confirmed that the framework would be amended on site and drawn back away from the footpath.

The adjoining Borough Ward Member and applicant's agent had spoken on this matter during consideration of the full application earlier.

The Planning Officer advised that the principle of development for this proposal had already been established through grant of the original consent. Officers had sought enhancements to the boundary treatment and materials proposed. The application was acceptable to the Conservation Officer in terms of its impact on the form of a Grade II Listed Building

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/0845, listed building consent be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

- (i) TWC/2014/0671 – Land adjacent to Cheshire Cheese, Doseley Road, Doseley, Telford

This was an outline application for the erection of 13 dwellings with associated access, with all other matters reserved for consideration at a later stage. The application site comprised rough grassland measuring 0.53ha located just off Doseley Road, split between two paddocks forming part of the extended curtilage of the Cheshire Cheese Public House. The site had previously been used as a beer garden but was now described as surplus to requirements. The majority of the site excluding the access area from Doseley Road was designated as Green Network.

The Planning Officer advised on the principle of development, and the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework for a presumption in favour of sustainable development. She also drew attention to aspects of the report relating to residential development on designated Green Network land, highways issues, drainage, ecology, scale, character and design of development, mining legacy and proposed contributions through a Section 106 Agreement. Seven letters of objection had been received. In term of Green Network, the land in its current state was not accessible to the general public and not of a quality that merited its retention in relation to the objectives of Green Network policy. In addition, the proposal would provide community benefits in terms of contributions towards parks and open space improvements and primary education that outweighed any loss of Green Network. A Member referred to the disused railway line nearby, which might be considered at some stage by the Horsehay Steam Trust as a potential extension to its existing line of operating track, and whether any noise mitigation should be included in the conditioning of the application in order to protect future occupants of the houses. The Planning Officer advised that a more specific condition could be added to address this.

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/0671 authority be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant outline planning permission subject to the applicant entering into a section 106 legal agreement with the Local Planning Authority (terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager) in order to secure:

- A contribution of £600 per dwelling (2 or more bedroom properties) towards off-site environmental improvements for play and recreation;
- A contribution of £2,298 per dwelling (excluding one beds were this relevant) towards primary education;

and the conditions set out in the report, with authority delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to amend and add appropriately worded conditions, particularly in relation to noise mitigation if required.

(j) TWC/2015/0009 – 183 Woodside Road, Ketley, Telford

This was an application for a two storey side extension to be built to the rear or the original garage and the existing previously approved first floor side extension. The application was being determined by the Committee because the applicant was a Telford & Wrekin Councillor.

The Planning Officer advised that the proposed extension was well designed and of an appropriate scale and mass to be in keeping with the original dwelling. There was a minimal increase in ridge height, but it would not be detrimental to the street scene. There were no issues of overlooking from the extension, nor a loss of light to neighbouring properties.

**RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2015/0009 planning permission be approved subject to the conditions in the report.**

The meeting ended at 8.43pm

**Chairman:** .....

**Date:** .....

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 18 March 2015 at 6.00pm in the Telford Suite at Shropshire College Hotel School Ltd (The Telford Whitehouse Hotel), Watling Street, Wellington, Telford TF1 2NJ**

**PRESENT:** Councillors J C Minor (Chair), N A Dugmore, E J Greenaway, K R Guy, A S Jhawar, R T Kiernan, J Loveridge, L A Murray and C R Turley.

**ALSO PRESENT:** Councillor J Pinter (for Planning Application TWC/2014/0631).

#### **PC-080      MINUTES**

Cllr Dugmore asked members to note that his initials were “N A” and not “N G” as stated in the Minutes.

**RESOLVED** – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 25<sup>th</sup> February 2015 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

#### **PC-081      APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

None

#### **PC-082      DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

With regard to planning application TWC/2015/0060, Councillor N A Dugmore advised that he was a member of Lilleshall Donnington & Muxton Parish Council but had not taken part in any discussions relating to the application.

With regard to planning application TWC/2014/0178 Cllr C Turley advised that he was a Trustee on Severn Gorge Countryside Trust and the Ironbridge Gorge Trust.

#### **PC-083      DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS**

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist, addressed the Committee regarding recent changes with respect to the housing land supply.

Paragraph 47 of the NPPF made clear that the Local Planning Authority should identify the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing.

The Government’s Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) required that household projections published by DCLG should be the starting point for the estimate of local housing needs. The latest projections prepared by ONS were published on 28 February 2015.

The NPPF directed that unless a Council could identify a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land the national planning policies should apply with a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

In April 2014 a ruling in the High Court changed the way that Local Planning Authorities could determine whether they had a 5 year housing land supply. This allowed the Council to focus on the objectively assessed need for housing rather than the higher target figure derived from the 2004 Regional Spatial Strategy.

These changes enabled the Council to commission consultants in October 2014 to recalculate the Borough's housing needs using the ONS household projections that were scheduled for publication in Autumn 2014.

The DCLG only published the household projections 2012-2037 on 28<sup>th</sup> February. Following this, the consultants were able to advise the Council on 16<sup>th</sup> March 2015 in respect of the latest household projections. This provided the Council with an up-to-date, robust and defensible housing needs assessment that complied with recent case law that would stand up to scrutiny at any planning appeal or judicial challenge.

The Council was now satisfied that it has a five year housing land supply and a revised statement setting this out would be placed on the Council's website by the end of the week.

The Council now joined a small number of Councils in the country who could demonstrate a five year housing land supply.

This meant that the Council would be able to reject speculative, unplanned housing development in inappropriate locations and defend its decisions at appeal.

It was concluded that following legal advice this policy would be taken into account, where relevant, on applications with immediate and imminent effect.

In light of this information it was suggested that the following applications be deferred:

**TWC/2014/0178** – 21A St Michaels Close, Madeley, Telford, Shropshire TF7 5SD

**TWC/2014/0766** – Land South of 28 Beechfields Way, Newport, Shropshire

These applications would be brought back at the earliest possible date and would be determined and discussed following a different report being submitted. Objectors and supporters would be able to register to speak on any application that came before the Committee in a revised form.

A 1 hour briefing for Members on the new policy would be held prior to the next meeting of the Committee on 8<sup>th</sup> April 2105.

On being put to the vote it was unanimously:-

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning applications **TWC/2014/0178** and **TWC/2014/0766** that the applications be deferred and brought back at the earliest possible date.

**PC-084      SITE VISITS**

No site visits had been requested.

**PC-085      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 each planning application.

(a) TWC/2014/0631 – The Red Lion, 15 Holly Road, Little Dawley, Telford, Shropshire TF4 3HB

This was an application from Brooklands Trading Ltd for the demolition of existing public house and erection of 8 no dwellings with associated access and landscaping.

Members had previously attended a site visit at the proposed development site.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee on the application which the Committee had previously resolved to defer whilst further discussions with the applicant took place. The 5 year land supply was not relevant to this application as there was no reference to this in the Officer's report.

Mr Young, a local resident, addressed the Committee. He commented that the Developer had re-submitted the application without any amendments and that the objections to the application remained the same. Concerns were raised around the access and exit on Hafren Road. There was a more suitable solution on Holly Road which would include off road parking and ease the access and exit issues. There were no objections to the development site but issues with the plans. The Planning Officers had given advice and guidance which the Developers had chosen not to take up to reduce the number of units but that this had been declined on viability issues. The overriding factor remained the margins as opposed to the planning. It was noted that the developer needed to make a return on the investment but not to the detriment of the local community. Mr Young asked that as there had been no amendment to the submitted plans that this application be rejected.

Cllr A Scott, Parish Councillor for Dawley Hamlets, addressed the Committee and was perturbed that the Developer would not enter into discussions regarding the access and exit being on Holly Road as this was much safer than the entrance and exit being off Hafren Road. There were car parking and pedestrian facilities already available on Holly Road and this would reduce the risk with regard to pedestrian arrangements. He commented that the Applicant and Developer showed little concern with regard to the social housing and referred the Committee to an e-mail of the 8<sup>th</sup> October 2014 which read “. . . advised all dwellings for social rented use . . . reduce the size of dwellings . . .”. The Local Authority prided itself on Social Housing Plans and this was out of line with the policy. According to the plans the 2 bedroomed properties would have 63m<sup>2</sup> over 2 floors where the minimum should be 69m<sup>2</sup>. The 3 bedroomed houses

would be 78m<sup>2</sup> where the suggested space should be 93m<sup>2</sup> under the nationally prescribed space. Cllr Scott felt that this Development would be an accident waiting to happen and asked the Committee to reject the current plans.

Cllr J Pinter, Ward Councillor for Dawley Magna, addressed the Committee and noted that the plans had not been altered despite the Planning Officers advising the Developer to reduce the number of units. At the Planning Committee held on the 4<sup>th</sup> February the application had been deferred in order for the Developer to explore the issues of concern but the Developer had refused to do this. Cllr Pinter asked the Committee not to grant permission as the site was unacceptable due to its over-development and the permanent detrimental effect it would have particularly with regard to residents on Hafren Road.

Mr C Huntley, Applicant's Agent, addressed the Committee. With regard to the reduction in housing units a viability study had been undertaken. The Developer would be losing in excess of £50,000 and it would need to have 10 units on the development before it became viable. He noted that the residents did not want the access off Hafren Road but the Highway Authority did not want access to the development off Holly Road. The development was on a brownfield site in a sustainable location with a smaller density and better car parking. The Scheme had Planning Officer support and the scheme gave valuable housing for the Community.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee. The application was for 8 dwellings following demolition of the public house. Further discussions had taken place regarding density and access arrangements. A viability assessment had been undertaken by the Developer with regard to the achieved profit levels and Officers accepted that fewer units would impact on the viability of the development. The Agent had made no changes to the application. The Committee were asked to determine the application in its current form, as it was on the 4<sup>th</sup> February, the details of which remained unchanged.

During the debate Members raised concerns with regard to the access and the density of the Development and felt that it had been deferred for good reasons. There was some confusion as to why the Highway Authority were objecting to the access on Holly Road as the public house had stood on Holly Road for quite some time with access to the car park off Holly Road. The visibility on Holly Road was more acceptable and was not as congested as Hafren Road. Further concerns were raised regarding access for emergency vehicles and the turning head on Hafren Road and the impact on access points.

The Development Management Service Delivery Manager informed the Committee that the Highway Engineers had objected to the access on Holly Road the key reason being the visibility splay.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist gave the Members a summary of the important points.

On being put to the vote, it was unanimously:-

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/0631 that the application be refused for the following reasons:

1. access to the development on Hafren Road;
2. access for emergency vehicles;
3. the density;
4. the impact on the surrounding area; and
5. the design and layout of the proposed development.

(b) W2006/1318 – Sambrook Hall Farm, Sambrook, Shropshire

This application was for a variation to the S106 Legal Agreement which was submitted to the Council in 2006 for the erection of 9 no dwellings and alterations to existing vehicular access and provision of new pedestrian access at Sambrook Hall Farm, Sambrook. The original application had allowed for 5 affordable units but this had become unviable and the development had stalled. A request had been received to reduce the affordable housing to 1 unit. Cllr S Burrell has advised that Chetwynd Parish Council were unhappy with the reduction in affordable housing as they supported the initial scheme partly because of the provision of 5 affordable units but Government guidance allowed for variation if developments become economically unviable. The variation was for 1 unit of affordable housing and a £15,000 contribution towards the village hall.

Mr D Haston, Applicant's Agent addressed the Members. The development was a bespoke scheme with good urban design and added value to the village. The scheme originally set out to delivery 3 affordable units plus £15,000 for the village hall. The Council had secured 5 affordable units and all conditions were formally discharged. The development commenced but delivery of the scheme had become unviable and had since stalled. If the construction of two larger units only was to take place this would not trigger the financial payment. The new S106 would facilitate approval of the scheme. Through the NPPF and NPG the scheme had been appraised and it was confirmed that the scheme was no longer viable and may not come to fruition without variation of the S106 agreement. In order to achieve the 1 unit of affordable housing some concessions had been made on the part of the owner being lower profit margins, the scaling back of the largest unit and the continuation of the payment of £15,000 towards the village hall. Mr Haston asked the Committee to support the variation of the S106 agreement.

Members considered the application and on being put to the vote it was unanimously:-

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application W2006/1318 the S106 agreement be re-drafted to ensure that one unit of affordable housing was provided in addition to the financial contribution of £15,000 towards the village hall.

(c) TWC/2015/0060 – Site of Coddon Sports and Social Club, Wellington Road, Donnington, Telford, Shropshire

This application was for the erection of 29 no dwellings with associated access roads, parking drainage and landscaping.

An update report was tabled at the meeting, which contained conditions from the Arboricultural Officer with regard to the development.

The Planning Officer addressed the Members regarding the application which had been submitted by Wrekin Housing Trust. The development was for 100% affordable, social housing on the former site of the Coddon Sports and Social Club which was currently in a poor state of repair following fire damage and vandalism. The scheme would be a much needed improvement for the area which would incorporate a communal area with good separation distance. There would be no detrimental impact on the surrounding area and there would be a single point of access from Wellington Road. A S106 agreement would be undertaken for the financial contribution of £80,000 towards the provision of bowling which would be achieved by pooling contributions from other S106 agreements. No issues arose regarding the housing land supply and there had been no objections.

Members considered the application and welcomed the scheme that contained much needed one bedroom affordable housing. The development was considered to be a good use of the site and the introduction of the wooden fencing was an improvement. Members also appreciated the excellent pooled financial contribution of £80,000 towards the provision of bowling facilities in the Borough.

On being put to the vote, it was unanimously:-

**RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2015/0060 that delegated authority be granted to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant planning permission subject to:**

- 1. The applicant entering into a S106 Legal Agreement with the Local Planning Authority in relation to:**
  - a. a contribution of £80,000 towards replacement bowling facilities; and**
  - b. the provision of 100% affordable (social rented) housing.**
- 2. The conditions contained within the report.**

The meeting ended at 6.42pm

**Chairman:** .....

**Date:** .....

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

### Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 8<sup>th</sup> April 2015 at 6.00pm in the Telford Suite at Shropshire College Hotel School Ltd (The Telford Whitehouse Hotel), Watling Street, Wellington, Telford TF1 2NJ

**PRESENT:** Councillors J C Minor (Chair), N A Dugmore, E J Greenaway, K R Guy, R T Kiernan, J Loveridge, A A Mackenzie (as substitute for A S Jhawar), L A Murray and C R Turley.

#### **PC-086**      MINUTES

**RESOLVED** – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 18 March 2015 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

#### **PC-087**      APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillor A S Jhawar.

#### **PC-088**      DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

With regard to planning application TWC/2015/0177 Councillor E J Greenaway advised that she was a member of Lawley & Overdale Parish Council but had not been involved in any discussions on this application.

With regard to planning application TWC/2014/1053, Councillor R T Kiernan advised that he was a member of the Wrekin Masonic Association (the applicants), and would withdraw from the meeting during consideration of this application.

With regard to planning application TWC/2014/1053, Councillor N A Dugmore advised that he was a member of a masonic association, but not the one that had submitted the planning application.

With regard to planning application TWC/2014/0178, Councillor C R Turley advised that he was a Council appointed Trustee to the Severn Gorge Countryside Trust and the Ironbridge Gorge Museum Trust

With regard to planning application TWC/2014/0178, Councillor K R Guy advised that he was a member of Madeley Town Council but had not been involved in any discussions on this application.

#### **PC-089**      DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS

None.

#### **PC-090**      SITE VISITS

None

## **PC-091      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 each planning application.

- (a)            TWC/2015/0177 - Land off Park Road/Royal Way, Malinslee, Telford, Shropshire

This was a full application for the erection of 81 dwellings with associated access, parking and landscaping. The application site (1.64ha) was currently an area of open ground that had once formed part of a colliery spoil mound, and was located on the northern edge of the Malinslee neighbourhood. The principle of residential development on the site had been established with approval in February 2014 of an application for the erection of 93 dwellings. This application sought an amendment to that scheme by removing the proposed apartments and replacing them with bungalows. As previously, the site would provide entirely affordable housing for rent, and would be owned and managed by the Wrekin Housing Trust. An update report was tabled at the meeting which contained additional consultation responses from Highways and Development Plans. Two further objections had been received from neighbouring properties, but these had not raised any new issues. The update report also contained a revised recommendation, and the Council's Solicitor advised that this needed to be further amended to reflect the need for a deed of variation linking this application to the existing Section 106 Agreement from the previous permission. Since the Section 106 Agreement was entered into, a figure of £44,981.84 had been proposed for the future adoption of open space.

A member of Lawley & Overdale Parish Council had been due to address the Committee, but was now unable to attend the meeting. The Parish Council's objections were set out in the report.

Ms S Woodvine, a local resident, addressed the Committee and expressed the view that the development would completely change the character of the local area, which was of a semi-rural nature. This would be overwhelmed by this development. There were concerns about highway safety as a result of this development, with already busy roads and a history of accidents in the vicinity. There would also be an adverse impact on the already busy roundabout close to Southwater, and it would be better to provide an access off West Central Way. In terms of pedestrian safety, there were insufficient pavements and footpaths in the area.

Mr P Dover, the applicant's agent, addressed the Committee and stated that this was a 100% affordable housing scheme that would help to address the shortfall of such housing in the Borough area. The amended application had reduced the number of dwellings by twelve, with lower density bungalows replacing the higher density blocks. The density was now around 49 dwellings per hectare, which was in line with local planning guidelines. The application complied fully with the National Planning Policy Framework and with local planning policies. There were no objections from the Council's Highways department, and that the issues raised by the Tree Officer could be addressed through effective woodland management.

The Planning Officer advised on the principle of development, highways impacts, design considerations, affordable housing and the viability of the development, open space provision, contributions for education provision and trees/woodland/landscape considerations. In terms of the revised density of dwellings, this was in accordance with the guidelines contained in the Central Telford Area Action Plan (CTAAP). The applicants had clarified certain detailed aspects of highway design and matters relating to pedestrian-cycle access provision and number of visitor car parking spaces. The amended recommendation contained conditions proposed by the Highways Engineer in relation to the access arrangements and the provision of a footway/cycleway link. The application site was considered to be in a highly sustainable location, one of CTAAP's preferred housing sites and close to bus services, leisure facilities, schools and the town centre. The proposed site was available and deliverable, and would deliver a significant number of affordable dwellings. The amended application did not raise any significant new issues or adverse impacts on existing residential amenity etc. The application was therefore recommended for approval subject to the variation of the Section 106 Agreement and to appropriate conditions.

Some Members expressed concern at the impact the development would have on the local highway network, resulting in increased safety concerns for drivers and pedestrians. In response to a question about the proposed mix of accommodation, the Planning Officer confirmed that it was a 100% affordable rented housing scheme. In response to a question about the commuted sum for the adoption of open space, the Council Solicitor advised that this was the amount that had been calculated by Parks and Open Spaces based on the amended application. However, it would be up to the applicant to decide whether to take up that option. Members noted that the principle of development on this brownfield site had been established, and that the amended application was beneficial in terms of the provision of bungalows and a reduction in the overall density.

It was moved and seconded that the amended recommendation in the update report be approved. On being put to the vote, it was:-

**RESOLVED** – that with respect to planning application TWC/2015/0177 authority be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant planning permission, subject to a deed of variation linking the application with the existing Section 106 agreement, and subject to the conditions set out in the update report.

(b) TWC/2014/0178 – 21A St Michael's Close, Madeley, Telford, Shropshire

This was an outline application for the erection of two dwellings with associated access. The application site comprised garden land adjacent to 21A St Michael's Close on the southern edge of the Madeley area. The site sloped considerably west to east towards Coalport Road, which formed the boundary of the Severn Gorge Conservation Area and the Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage Site. The site fell within the Borough's Green Network designation, including the existing property. The application sought permission for the creation of vehicular access off St Michael's Close, but with all other matters reserved for later approval. The application had been deferred at the last meeting of the Committee on 18 March 2015, and Members had undertaken a site visit prior to that meeting.

Mr A Cousins and Mrs J Millward, local residents, addressed the Committee and expressed the view that the development would have a dominating impact on neighbouring properties resulting in loss of privacy. This would constitute an infringement of their human rights. The proposed site was subject to flooding and land instability, and was completely unsuitable for development. The development would constitute an unacceptable extension into the Green Network contrary to Local Plan policies, and would have a detrimental impact on the adjacent World Heritage Site.

Mr C Roberts, the applicant's agent, advised that the application had been subject to considerable discussion over the last 10 months, resulting in revised plans to make it more acceptable and to address local residents' concerns. The application did not present any significant conflict with national and local planning policies, and the practical matters such as land stability, drainage and highways had been addressed to the satisfaction of the statutory consultees on these issues. It had been accepted by the Planning Officer in the report that the development would not significantly affect the amenities of neighbouring dwellings. There had been objections on the grounds of loss of views and impact on property values, but these were not material planning considerations.

The Planning Officer advised on the principle of residential development, the loss of Green Network land and the associated impact on local wildlife and existing trees, ground stability and whether the site was suitable to accommodate further development, and the impact on amenities of neighbouring properties and the character of the area. In terms of the Green Network, it was considered that the site was not compatible with many of the principles on such designation, being part of a residential curtilage where permitted development rights existed, being enclosed and inaccessible to the public and having negligible ecological or wildlife value. In relation to land stability, the applicant had submitted a verified Slope Stability Declaration Form which concluded that there was no engineering reason why the proposed development should not proceed. Some information had been received that day from the Shropshire Archaeological Service regarding a possible medieval boundary bank and ditch at the eastern edge of the site, and some further details were tabled for Members. Large parts of the probably post-medieval ditch had already been destroyed, and the Archaeological Officer had not raised any objections to the development nor any necessity for conditions for archaeological works to be

undertaken. The application was therefore recommended for approval subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

During the ensuing discussion, Members referred to their visit to the site, which they had found to be very poorly drained with water discharging onto the land. There were historic drainage and flooding problems at this site, and there was concern that this was contributing to land instability in the immediate vicinity. Concerns were also raised about whether there was a demonstrable need for housing in this location and whether the site could support two dwellings. Reference was also made to the proximity of the World Heritage Site and Severn Gorge Conservation Area, and it was believed that this was a sensitive site in terms of the character of the area. Members considered the potential benefits that the development might bring, but concluded that these were outweighed by the harm that would be caused to the character of the site and the immediate area.

It was therefore moved and seconded that the application be refused. On being put to the vote, it was unanimously:-

**RESOLVED** – That with respect to planning application TWC/2014/0178, outline planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

- **Over-development of the site, constrained by the site's boundaries, topography and parking arrangements;**
- **Inappropriate development within the Green Network, on a sensitive location as an approach into the Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage Site and Severn Gorge Conservation Area;**
- **Insufficient information to establish the adequate drainage of the site.**

Councillor R.T. Kiernan left the meeting room before consideration of the next application.

(c) TWC/2014/1053 – Site of Masonic Building, Constitution Hill, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire

This was an outline application for the erection of 4 dwellings with associated access. All other matters were reserved at this stage. The application site was located to the west of the Masonic Hall, and was currently redundant land within a largely residential area of mixed housing types. The existing access from Constitution Hill would be widened to form a shared access road serving the proposed dwellings and the retained car park for the Masonic Hall.

Ms J Bleach, the applicant's agent, stated that the application had been subject to considerable consultation, and the layout and elevations of the development had been designed to avoid overlooking of neighbouring properties or causing adverse impact on their amenity. The proposed number of parking spaces exceeded that required by the Highways Engineer, and there would be sufficient parking for the Masonic Lodge. The site was in a very sustainable location and was in accordance with local and national planning policies. The proposed development would help to

fund much needed renovation works to the Masonic Hall building, and to build a dining room extension.

The Planning Officer advised on the principle of development, the character and appearance of the proposed development, impact on amenities of neighbouring properties, parking and highway safety, ecology and drainage. There had been 15 letters of objection to the application, but it was considered that this was an acceptable development whose layout and scale would not compromise the amenity of nearby properties. The development was in a sustainable location and was highly accessible to the district centre of Wellington.

Members noted that the principle of development on the site had been previously established some years ago, and that this was currently redundant land in a highly sustainable location.

It was therefore moved and seconded that the recommendation in the report be approved. On being put to the vote, it was:-

**RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/1053, planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report.**

#### **PC-092      TREE PRESERVATION ORDER**

The Arboricultural Officer presented the report of the Assistant Director: Law, Democracy & People Services concerning the making of a provisional Tree Preservation Order at Princess Avenue, Arleston, Telford, and which sought confirmation of the Order.

On 17 February 2015, a provisional Tree Preservation Order (TPO) was made in respect of two copper/purple beech trees and one silver birch tree at Princess Avenue, Arleston, as identified on the plan attached to the report. An objection to the TPO was received from the landowner, Wrekin Housing Trust, in respect of all three trees. A copy of the objection and supporting documents was appended to the report.

In response to questions regarding the acquisition of the land by the current landowner, the Assistant Director: Planning Specialist confirmed that the amenity land was purchased from the Council by the Housing Trust. However it was not unusual for a TPO to be served if there was a potential threat to trees of value from subsequent development. The Arboricultural Officer advised that the trees dated back to the early 1930s when the estate was constructed and now formed a major amenity attribute to the area, encouraging wildlife and providing scale to the area. The Housing Trust had confirmed that they wished to redevelop the amenity area, but it was considered that the amenity value of the trees outweighed any reasons given for their removal.

**RESOLVED – that the Borough of Telford & Wrekin (Trees at Princess Avenue, Arleston, Telford TF1 2LJ) Tree Preservation Order 2015 be confirmed without modification.**

The meeting ended at 7.08 pm

**Chairman:** .....

**Date:** .....

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 3rd June 2015 at 6.00pm in the Haybridge Restaurant, Telford College of Arts and Technology, Haybridge Road, Wellington, Telford TF 1 2NP**

**PRESENT:** Councillors J C Minor (Chair), N A Dugmore, E J Greenaway, N Lowery, J Loveridge, M Smith, P Scott and C R Turley.

The Chair informed the Committee that the Tree Preservation Order would be moved up the Agenda and heard prior to the Planning Applications for Determination.

#### **PC-001 MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 8 April 2015 be confirmed and signed by the Chair subject to the following change:

With regard to PC-088 – TWC/2015/0177 Councillor E J Greenaway advised that she was a “Ward Member for Lawley & Overdale” and not “Lawley and Overdale Parish Council”.

#### **PC-002 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

No apologies had been received.

#### **PC-003 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

With regard to Item D on the Agenda – the Article 4(2) Direction Report, Councillor C R Turley advised that he was a Councillor appointed Trustee to the Severn Gorge Countryside Trust and the Ironbridge Gorge Museum Trust.

With regard to planning application TWC/2014/0671 Councillor E J Greenaway advised that she was the ward member of Horsehay and Lightmoor but had not been involved in any discussions on this application.

With regard to planning application TWC/2015/0254, Councillor N Lowery advised that she was the ward member for The Gorge but had not been involved in any discussions on this application.

#### **PC-004 DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS**

The Development Management Service Delivery Manager informed the Committee that the applicant had withdrawn application TWC/2014/1054 – 1 Moorhead, Preston Upon The Weald Moors, Telford, TF6 6DL.

The Committee were also informed that the applicant and officers had requested that with regard to TWC/2015/0220 – Site of Roden Nurseries, Roden Lane, Roden, Telford that the application be deferred to allow investigations to take place regarding the water supply for wider community benefit.

## **PC-005 SITE VISITS**

TWC/2015/0196 – Car Park, Chapel Street, Oakengates – 4.30pm

## **PC-006 TREE PRESERVATION ORDER**

The report of the Assistant Director: Law, Democracy & People Services was presented concerning the making of a provisional Tree Preservation Order at Roden Nurseries, Roden Lane, Roden, Telford which sought confirmation of the Order.

On 27 March 2015, a provisional Tree Preservation Order (TPO) was made in respect of four Red Oak trees and three English Oak trees within the grounds of Roden Nurseries, Roden Lane, Roden, Telford as identified on the plan attached to the report. An objection to the TPO was received from the Advance Land & Planning Ltd on behalf of their Client, in respect of all seven trees. A copy of the objection and supporting documents were appended to the report.

The TPO had been made in reaction to the planning application which sought to protect trees T1-T3 Red Oak trees which were adjacent to the highway and were of public amenity value and had good colour and good form. It also sought to protect T4-T7 which also had good community value. Trees T4 and T5 were both Red Oak Trees. T6 and T7 were Common Oaks. All of the trees gave good amenity value; they were near to existing dwellings and faced the highway. If the Committee decided to confirm the TPO and the application came forward again with the loss of T4 then the TPO could be modified to allow for the removal of Tree T4.

Further clarification was given to the Committee that a planning application may override the TPO if it came back before Committee but that this was a matter for the Committee to decide if and when it came forward. It was important to protect the trees in the first instance.

Cllr Dugmore raised concerns regarding the maturity of the trees and long-established trees if they have only been there for 10-15 years and was intrigued to establish why this collection of young trees had been the subject of a TPO as he understood the TPOs were put in place to protect very well established trees for a particular use.

The Arboricultural Officer informed the Committee that the Trees were on the roadside situated on a junction and were prominent within the landscape, the colour of the Red Oak trees during the autumn season enhanced the area and that these trees were 15 years into maturity and if these trees were replaced it would take a further 15 years for them to enhance and improve the area. TPOs could be made on areas of young trees and early maturity was not an issue. The trees would serve as a screen as the development was on along a roadside and would protect the development from highway lights at night. The trees did serve a purpose and were of amenity value.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist gave an observation on what he had heard which was that the trees were prominent and an important part of the

environment, the trees were in the early stages of maturity, but that it was important to protect trees now as well as in the future.

A further comment was made that if the trees weren't protected by the TPO then the owners could immediately chop them down.

Cllr J Greenaway commented that 15 years was a substantial amount of time for the tree to grow to a decent size and she, personally, did not want to lose the trees if the owners decided to cut them down.

Following the discussion it was:

**RESOLVED – that the Borough of Telford & Wrekin (Trees within the grounds of Roden Nurseries, Roden Lane, Roden, Telford TF6 6BP) Tree Preservation Order 2015 be confirmed without modification.**

#### **PC-007      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 each planning application.

- a) TWC/2013/0685 – Land adjoining Waters Upton Village Hall, Waters Upton, Telford, Shropshire

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that this application had previously been before the Committee on 11<sup>th</sup> December 2013. Members resolved to approve the S106 relating to the transfer of land at Waters Upton Parish Council. The S106 agreement had not been completed and the grant of permission remained outstanding. The decision was made at the time when the Council was unable to identify a 5 year housing land supply as required by the NPPF. Therefore Policies CS1 and CS7 were out of date and there was a strong presumption in favour of sustainable development. As the Council now had a deliverable 5 year housing land supply, a number of applications that had previously been the subject of resolutions to approve but no permissions issued need to be reconsidered. Three of these applications had been brought to this meeting to be re-considered on this basis. Applicants had been notified of the material change and that a period of consultation had taken place. In addition, since the resolution to grant had taken place, Waters Upton Neighbourhood Plan had been consulted upon in accordance with Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012. Reference was made to the NPPF Guidance which explained the weight to be given to emerging plans where they were at pre-examination stages of their progress and where there were unresolved objections to relevant policies. It was mentioned that the Council had raised a number of concerns whether some of the proposed policies met certain basic conditions as required by the Regulations. In all circumstances, whilst it was a material consideration, it was considered that limited weight that could be attached to the Waters Upton Neighbourhood Plan at this stage.

Cllr L Baker-Oliver spoke on behalf of Waters Upton Parish Council who considered now to be in a difficult position following the original application in 2013 and the fresh application. The original planning application was approved subject to the signing of the Section 106 agreement by way of community gain providing a village green, a village hall and car parking. Although this site was on greenfield land there would be benefits to Apple Trees Nursery and community gain. The NPPF no longer imposed a presumption in favour of development and Waters Upton now had a Neighbourhood Plan which carried significant weight regarding greenfield sites within village settings. Brownfield sites should be used without encroaching onto greenfield land as this would ensure gradual and sustainable growth over the next few years in order to benefit the communities involved. After careful consideration the Parish Council opposed the application.

Cllr S Bentley, Ward Member for Edgmond and Ercall Magna noted that the application had been brought back to Committee following the changes around the 5 year land supply. The Government directions were in favour of development and he fully supported that the application should be reconsidered. The report has now significantly changed but was now correct. If the S106 had been signed it would not have been called back. When the original application came to Committee there had been a lack of a 5 year housing land supply and applications could be approved regardless of being on a greenfield site and the Parish Council took a pragmatic view that this would be of benefit to the community and a deal was struck that £30,000 would be paid to the Parish Council for community benefit and to negate the need for affordable housing as it was not required within the village and to secure the benefit for the community and there was no objection to this. As there has now been a considerable delay, there are now objections to the application due to the Waters Upton Neighbourhood Plan. Although examination was needed to see how much weight it carried under the Localism Act and the DCLG guidance it was considered that the Plan carried significant weight as the land does not appear in the plan. As the Neighbourhood Plan was now complete this was significant reason to refuse the application.

Mrs S Wall, local resident, addressed the Committee and explained that residents had identified preferred brownfield sites for development. The legal position had now changed in relation to the DCLG Regulation 16 used in planning decisions. If the DCLG's regulations were not considered then the decision could be passed to the Secretary of State or be taken to judicial review. It was a statutory requirement, following the end of the consultation period on 6<sup>th</sup> March 2015, that the plan and the responses were examined and a decision made by the examiner. A letter had been sent to Jonathan Eatough and Richard Partington expressing their view that the lack of a decision was stopping their plan. No reply had yet been received. The Applicant did not agree with the Neighbourhood plan and the officers were following the planning process but the determination of the plan was by the examiner and not the local authority. Mrs Wall asked that Members refuse or defer the application whilst this issue was resolved.

Mr J Davies, Applicant's Agent, informed the Committee that this area much needed green open space and the affordable housing issues had caused the delay with the S106 agreement and this had led to the re-hearing of this application. The agent acknowledged the change in government criteria for affordable housing in the rural

area, but confirmed that the Applicant still stood by the previous agreement which proposed the area of open space in lieu of affordable housing as previously agreed and considered the application was policy compliant and sustainable. The application came under Neighbourhood Plan Policy 4, Policy 1 and 7, Policy UH4, Policy DS1 and 3, Policy WUA1, Policy WUA4, and Policy WLC3. Mr Davies was aware that the Neighbourhood Plan was not yet adopted and that the existing recommendations were now for approval. He also confirmed that the Planning Officers supported the application complying with the NPPF and the Core Strategy which was of benefit to the Local Community and considered sustainable.

Legal advice was given to Members that an important issue was how much weight was given to the Neighbourhood Development Plan bearing in mind the stage it had reached in its process. The legal adviser stated his view that there was no need to defer the application as the position regarding weight to be given to the Neighbourhood Development Plan in such circumstances was clear enough. Recent case law supported the view that limited weight should be given to the provisions of the draft Waters Upton Neighbourhood Plan. The legal advisor referred to a comment which had been made suggesting that applications that are granted which are in conflict with a Neighbourhood Development Plan could be reviewed by the Secretary of State or a Judicial Review process could be undertaken and clarified that he was not aware of any particular special process. The Applicant could lodge a judicial review if the application was approved. Policy CS7 was a material consideration; identifying Waters Upton as a suitable settlement due to the local facilities and services and was sustainable under the NPPF. The proposed development was in the centre of the village and was not encroaching on the countryside and was not isolated. No affordable housing was required on application with 10 units or less. There had been an element of affordable housing – 3 houses – but objections from the Parish Council had been received due to the lack of need and as such a number of options had come forward and it was agreed that there would be a transfer of land and that this still remained. It was suggested that the Members focus on the policy principles taking account of why this was being reconsidered by members and that the proposed development was still acceptable for approval subject to the signing of the S106.

Cllr C Turley commented that on the first submission of the outline planning permission there were concerns from the Parish Council but that this application had been approved and the S106 was progressing to completion. This gave additional land to the village hall as well as a front hedgerow which would contribute to the local Parish assets. Due to the non-completion of the S106 the scheme had been brought back to the Committee. The scheme adhered to policy and was of significant benefit to the community. Cllr Turley continued to support the application subject to the S106 agreeing to transfer the land as in Drawing 15 and the £30,000 for community benefit.

Cllr N Dugmore expressed that due to the change surrounding the 5 year housing land supply, this had not previously been significant or fundamental to approving or objecting to the application and the community got the best deal at the time. Due to the delay in signing the S106 the application has been brought back before the Committee. The Community had been working for 2 years on a local plan and the decision as members was how much weight to give to the plan. The Council now

had a 5 year land supply and less land needed to be bulldozed. Cllr Dugmore suggested that the plan be referred or rejected to wait to see if the Neighbourhood Plan was approved as the grounds may completely change. It was suggested that the Local Plan was followed as this was the point of Parish Councils having their plans.

Cllr J Greenaway raised concerns regarding the outline statement of 5 dwellings and this had now been changed to “up to 5 dwellings” Cllr Greenaway also asked if it was likely that the Plan would be in place before the reserved matters came back to Committee and she considered that the dwellings exceeded CS1 Planning Policy.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist addressed the Committee that the Council now had the 5 year housing land supply and it was important that the Committee used the up-to-date policy and use the relevant document to determine applications. The application complied with local policy and conformed to the NPPF and was in conformity with both national and local policy.

Cllr C Turley re-affirmed the notable benefit to the community as the parcel of land would provide outdoor play facilities for the Apple Trees Nursery and if this was removed the nursery would be lost.

The Planning Officer confirmed that this application sought to preserve the Nursery with the land being made available for the Parish Council ownership, but at present as this was leased it could be terminated. With regard to the number of houses, the reserved matters discussions were progressing with only 4 houses. Originally the application had 8 units which had been reduced to 5 and now stated up to 5. The plans attached to the application showed how 5 houses could be accommodated on the site together with the land to be transferred over and this was what members were approving. A change to the plan had occurred which had now squared off the land to the village hall, as confirmed by the title plans. The Application was originally submitted in 2013 and officers were recommending for approval prior to the 5 year housing supply announcement in November 2013. In all the circumstances and bearing in mind the policy consequences of now having a five year housing supply this application was now brought forward for approval.

Following the discussion it was:

**RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2013/0685 authority be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant outline planning permission, subject to the applicant entering into a S106 agreement to transfer the ownership of land as shown on Drawing No 15 Land Transfer Plan to Waters Upton Parish Council for community benefit subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.**

b) TWC/2015/0196 – Car Park, Chapel Street, Oakengates, Telford, Shropshire

The Planning Officer presented the report which was a change of use from a private car park to a hand car wash and valet facility. The hours of operation were 9am to 6pm Monday to Saturday and 9am to 1pm on Sundays. A portable building would

be erected on the site for use as a customer waiting area and secure storage for equipment. There would be space for 4 cars to be washed and 4 cars to be valeted.

Mr C Kelleher, on behalf of Oakengates Town Council, raised concerns regarding the application and informed members that objections had been made by the Parish Council and the shops either side of the car park. The applicant had lain cabling under the highway breaking regulation 7671. There was no direct water supply and hosepipes would have to be laid across the highway. Drainage was a problem on the site with the drains being blocked and there was no provision for drainage. The Japanese Knotweed had been cut down. Mr Kelleher explained that the applicants had shown aggressive behaviour and he was concerned regarding this. Large lorries currently blocked the road when deliveries took place which couldn't happen if the car park was used for a business. This was not a simple situation and needed careful consideration.

The Planning Officer commented that the site was privately owned and objections had been received by the Town Council and local residents. Concerns were raised regarding the highway, due to poor visibility, but officers considered this to be a suitable location in principle to support growth. Officers carefully considered the objections but there were no vehicular movements that have not been previously undertaken by vehicular use and it was considered that these would be limited movements. This application was therefore recommended for approval on a 12 month temporary consent subject to highways and hours of use. The electrical aspect would be raised with the Highways Engineers if it has crossed local authority footpaths. There were no comments regarding the Knotweed and no concerns had been raised.

The Members discussed if it would be necessary to have a site visit in order to assess this application fully. Following the discussion it was:

**RESOLVED - that with respect to planning application TWC/2015/0196 it was unanimously agreed that the application be deferred in order for a site visit to take place.**

- c) TWC/2014/0272 – Ivydale, High Street, Coalport, Telford, Shropshire  
TF8 7HZ

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that this application had previously been to Committee on 5<sup>th</sup> November 2014 where Members resolved to approve the application subject to a S106 for financial contribution for offsite recreation facilities. Due to the S106 remaining unsigned the resolution to grant remained outstanding. This decision was made at a time when the Council was unable to identify a 5 year housing land supply, as required by the NPPF. Whilst the reports and the minutes did not make reference to the 5 year land supply, the consequences of having a 5 year land supply were now a material consideration. This was the second of the three applications that members had been asked to re-consider and had followed the same notification period to both the applicant and consultees.

Cllr C Turley praised the proposed development.

Cllr J Greenaway raised on query with regard to the site visit which had previously been undertaken in regard to the footway and highway improvement.

Cllr P Scott commented that he had not been part of the decision making on the original Application but that this development was one that most people were in favour of and was beneficial to a lot of people.

Cllr N Dugmore also raised the footway issue, together with the narrowness of the bridge and the need to cross the road to access the footpath and asked if this could be dealt with under the reserved matters.

Mr A Williams, the Applicant's Agent, was invited to respond to the comments regarding the footway. At the site visit discussions took place regarding the footpath at the top end of the cul-de-sac. The plans on P52 and P53 to the report showed the slight difference with P53 showing a little input at the bottom of the cul-de-sac which led through to the Silkin way and High Street and that this was part of the scheme. Mr Williams did not think that the bridge would be a suitable place to provide a footpath as this would be too narrow. The S106 agreement was ready for completion.

Following the discussion it was:

**RESOLVED - that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/0272 it was unanimously agreed that authority be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant planning permission subject to a S106 agreement for the provision of £600 per dwelling towards enhancement works to the neighbouring Silkin Way and the conditions set out in the report.**

- d) TWC/2014/0671 – Land adjacent to Cheshire Cheese, Doseley Road, Doseley, Telford, Shropshire

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that this application had previously been considered by Members on the 25<sup>th</sup> February 2015. On this occasion Members had approved the application subject to the S106 financial contributions towards off-site recreation facilities. The S106 agreement had not been completed and the resolution to grant remained outstanding. The decision was made at a time when the Council had been unable to identify a 5 year housing land supply as required by the NPPF. Although the minutes and reports did not directly reference the 5 year housing land supply, this had now become a material consideration due to development plan housing supply policies no longer being regarded as being out of date. This was the third of three applications for consideration by Members at this meeting and had followed the same notification period to both the applicant and consultees. The S106 specific details were considered to be compliant with the Community Infrastructure Regulations with contributions to be made towards the proposed children's play area at Doseley Plant Pipeworks and the education provision to Captain Webb Primary School.

Cllr N Dugmore raised a question as to whether the Steam Railway were aware of the planning application.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist confirmed that they were aware and that the Steam Railway were currently working openly on a plot in Lawley area but were satisfied that this development would not impair their aspirations.

Cllr J Greenaway raised issues regarding noise mitigation if the application was approved and who would be responsible to put this in place and how this would be achieved. It would be difficult for her to support the application following these concerns

The Planning Officer confirmed that the Steam Railway would be responsible for any noise that caused a statutory nuisance and other legislative powers would enable protection from noise sources. Members were advised that as an application from the Steam Railway had not yet come forward that it would not be just and reasonable to condition any noise mitigation from a source that did not exist and that officers recommended that the application was approved, if they were so minded and any statutory noise nuisance would need to be raised with the Environmental Health Team at the time of any event.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist confirmed to the Members that the Steam Railway were not concerned with the proposed development and the houses being close by did not appear to be an issue. The Steam Railway only operated at weekends and it had secure boundaries. If noise mitigation was raised as an issue then further fences could be installed.

Following the discussion it was:

**RESOLVED - that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/0671 it was agreed that authority be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant planning permission subject to a S106 agreement for the provision of £600 per dwelling towards offsite improvements at Doseley Pipeworks or Shirefields and £2298 per dwelling towards the refurbishment of the Captain Webb Primary School and the conditions set out in the report.**

- e) TWC/2014/1151 – Telford Millennium Community (Part of Phase 4), Ketley, Telford, Shropshire

This Application sought full planning permission for 52 apartments and 14 dwellings together with associated parking, roadways, landscaping and areas of open space. It also sought to vary the planning permission under TWC/2013/0096, which was originally for 375 units, by a further 29 units. This was the final phase of the development of the community housing scheme. The first two phases of the current scheme had consisted of 2 and three storey units and 3 storey apartments, together with terraced units. The submission of a viability study had been completed in 2013 by the Applicant. The proposal brought forward was smaller to the original offer, but this would enable the development to be brought forward somewhat earlier. The Group specialist had reported that the £2.4m towards the S106 contributions would not be affected by this change and that there had been no objections. The principle for development had been established since 2013 and the development was proposed along the spine road. The design was far superior and gave an imposing entrance with good views across open spaces. The Urban Design Officer had been

involved with the proposed development and gave a better solution to the sloping site. Members were asked to approve the S106 for this development and/or a Deed of Variation for the S106 associated with the original planning consent.

Cllr J Greenaway raised a query regarding the parking space allocation of 2 spaces per dwelling as to whether this was adequate.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the allocation was relative as the units were apartments and there had been no objections from Highway Officers.

Cllr N Dugmore raised a further query regarding the figures for car ownership and suggested that 1.23 cars per household was a little on the low side. Although he welcomed the development which needed completing, he considered that the parking allocation was still insufficient. Cllr Dugmore requested updated figures on cars per household.

The Planning Officer confirmed that although the original submission was 1.5 spaces per house, the type of units had now been amended to apartments and it was less likely that there would be a need for 2 parking spaces per apartment and she reiterated that the Highway Officers had not objected to the application.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist confirmed that the information requested by Cllr Dugmore would be provided following the meeting. The current position was that the Highway Officers were satisfied with the proposed development. The Learning Community was a complete form of development and was 1 of only 6 in the country to be approved. The development site had been a successful government site and the former Blockleys Brick Works was a success story.

Following the discussion it was:

**RESOLVED:** that with respect to planning application TWC/2014/1151 it was unanimously agreed that authority be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant full planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the report and that it was necessary for the development to be tied into the S106 agreement negotiated as part of permission TWC/2013/0096 and required planning obligations would be entered into to achieve this.

f) TWC/2015/0254 – 60 Hodge Bower, Ironbridge, Telford, Shropshire TF8 7QE

The Application sought consent for the erection of a detached garden room for use as an office within the grounds of Hodge Bower.

The Planning Officer explained that the Application had been brought to Committee as it was an application from an Assistant Director. No objections had been received and there were no concerns regarding the design or location.

It was:

**RESOLVED** - that with respect to planning application TWC/2015/0254 it was unanimously agreed that authority be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager to grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the report.

**PC-008      CLARIFYING THE TERMINOLOGY IN THE ARTICLE 4(2)  
DIRECTION IN THE IRONBRIDGE WORLD HERITAGE  
SITE/SEVERN GORGE CONSERVATION AREA**

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist presented the report on the Article 4 Direction on the Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage Site.

This report sought Members confirmation that the definition within the Article 4(2) Direction was correct and that this ensured that the officers used this in the correct manner.

Paragraph 1.3 to the report set out the definition which was important to ensure that the Council managed visible change to listed houses within the Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage Site.

The risks to the site were listed at 4.2 to the report and sought to manage continual erosion by small changes which was now a nationally reported official statistic. The Borough was fortunate that its conservation area was not deemed to be “at risk”. This was due to comprehensive planning controls and sound policy framework which were in place and looked after the area.

English Heritage was actively encouraging all Local Authorities to use their powers under Article 4 Directions to ensure that erosion of our historic environment was prevented.

Cllr N Dugmore queries the word “frontage” within the report.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist confirmed that this meant “that which was visible”. He further confirmed that the Council tried to ensure that changes were managed and applications came before the Board to make the appropriate decision.

Following the discussion it was:

**RESOLVED** – that the report of the Assistant Director: Planning Specialist be unanimously noted and endorsed.

The meeting ended at 7.39pm

Chairman: .....

Date: .....