

BOROUGH OF TELFORD & WREKIN

Minutes of a meeting of the Borough of Telford & Wrekin held on Thursday, 11 December 2008 at 6.30 pm, at the Civic Offices, Telford.

PRESENT:

Councillors I.T.W. Fletcher (Speaker), D.G. Allen, G. Ashcroft, D.W.D. Ashley (Deputy Speaker – in the Chair for Item 1), R.K. Austin, R. Aveley, S. Bentley, S.P. Burrell, E.J. Carter, R.G. Chaplin, G.J.L. Davies, J.A. Dixon, N.A. Dugmore, A.J. Eade (Leader), V.A. Fletcher, J.A. Francis, G.M. Green, E.J. Greenaway, R.E. Groom (Mayor), P.A.E. Homer, M.B. Hosken, G.P. Hossell, S.M. Kelly, R.T. Kiernan, A. Lawrence, L. Lomax, A.A. Mackenzie, C.N. Mason, A.D. McClements, A.A. Meredith, J.C. Minor, C.P.R. Mollett, R.A. Overton, F.R. Picken, H. Rhodes, K.S. Sahota, U.E. Sambrook, J.M. Seymour, C.F. Smith, A.J. Stanton, E.M. Swift, W.L. Tomlinson, V. Tonks, D.R.W. White, A.G.P. Williams and H.J. Williams

46. ELECTION OF SPEAKER

The Deputy Speaker called for nominations for the position of Speaker. Three Councillors were proposed and seconded:

Councillor D.G. Allen
Councillor H. Rhodes
Councillor I.T.W. Fletcher

In accordance with the Council Procedure Rules set out in the Constitution, voting was by show of hands. Councillor D.G. Allen was eliminated on the first vote and, following a second vote Councillor I.T.W. Fletcher was elected as Speaker for the remainder of the municipal year 2008-09.

RESOLVED – that Councillor I.T.W. Fletcher be elected as Speaker for the remainder of the municipal year 2008-09.

47. PRAYERS

The Reverend Marilyn Peters, Team Rector for Central Telford, said prayers.

48. MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Borough Council held on 25 September, 2008 be confirmed and signed by the Speaker.

49. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors K.T. Blundell, E.A. Clare, Y.C. Hicks, T.J. Hope, M.J. Smith, K.L. Tomlinson, R.M. Tyler and D.G. Wright

50. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor L. Lomax declared a personal interest in agenda item 15 b

51. ANNOUNCEMENTS

(a) Mayoral Engagements

The Mayor, Councillor R.E. Groom, presented the Mayoral Engagements report. He highlighted his visit to Newport Rotary Club's 50th Charter Dinner and informed Members that the organisation had raised over £500,000 since its inception. He also made reference to the Helping Hand organisation which, unfortunately, due to a lack of volunteers and funding, would be disbanded in March 2009. Members noted the engagements undertaken by the Mayor or the Deputy Mayor between 22 September and 2 December, 2008.

(b) Awards/Achievements

The Mayor paid tribute to Telford Olympians Ricky Balshaw and Mickey Bushell and presented certificates honouring their achievements, which Members acknowledging by standing in tribute.

The Mayor presented Bob Hesketh, Senior Architectural Designer and Mark Young, Quantity Surveyor with the 'highly commended' award in the Civic Building of the Year Award from the Society of Chief Architects for Local Authorities for their work on the Shortwood School in Wellington.

52. NOTICE OF MOTION

Councillor C.F. Smith proposed, seconded by Councillor R.K. Austin, that agenda item 12(b), the Motion relating to the Health Review, be moved up the agenda. In accordance with paragraph 2.2(ii) of the Council Procedure Rules, the Speaker gave his approval.

Councillor A.J. Eade, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 12, moved the following Motion:

"Telford & Wrekin Council notes the recent Health Review and is committed to working with its partners and the public to ensure that the provision of hospital and other health services in Telford & Wrekin meet the current and future needs of the communities of the Borough and east Shropshire, as well as being of the highest clinical quality."

The motion was seconded by Councillor R.K. Austin.

Councillor J.M. Seymour said it was vital that the Review was for the longer term, as there was no guarantee that an interim solution would not become a long term solution. Recent economic uncertainty meant that nothing could be taken for granted. The Review needed to look to the future and reflect the clinical and community needs of Telford & Wrekin, east Shropshire and some northern parts of the county.

Councillor S.P. Burrell said that the population gap was set to grow as the Borough's population was both younger and growing faster than that of Shropshire. He pointed to the higher rates of deprivation of children in the Borough when compared with that of Shropshire and said in-patient paediatric services and neo-natal services should be located in the area of most deprivation.

Councillor G.M. Green pointed out that there was a larger catchment population within a twenty minute drive of the Princess Royal Hospital site than elsewhere in the area. 62% of Shropshire residents lived within a forty minute drive of the Princess Royal Hospital, compared with 44% living within a forty minute drive of the Royal Shrewsbury Hospital. She expressed her concerns that moving services away from the Princess Royal Hospital would both threaten its long term viability, and have a detrimental impact on people from the most deprived Wards in the Borough who, without cars would face a long and complicated journey to the Royal Shrewsbury Hospital by public transport. The alternative was an expensive taxi journey.

Councillor W.L. Tomlinson said that the Review should be careful not to undermine the future viability of acute services. He felt that reducing services or putting them on the wrong site would undermine the Shrewsbury & Telford Hospitals NHS Trust and pointed out that the relocation of services away from Telford would have an adverse effect on income, which could potentially undermine the viability of both hospitals.

Councillor D.R.W. White undertook that when the proposals were subject to public consultation a rigorous scrutiny process would be undertaken by the Joint Health Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor R.K. Austin warned that decisions made in the coming months needed to be the right ones. He informed Members that the Borough's population was projected to reach 200,000 by 2026, a level of growth which amounted to 17% compared with 7% growth in Shropshire. In addition, 26,500 new homes were planned for the Borough by 2026 which was proportionately more than that for Shropshire.

Councillor A.J. Eade said that it was vital that key services remained accessible for people within the Borough but also for the many communities around Albrighton, Bridgnorth, Broseley, Shifnal and Market Drayton. He stressed that the Council was fully supportive of the Princess Royal Hospital and would seek to ensure that the Review maintained its levels of service. The goal was to obtain enhanced health care provision for the Borough and the Council would not allow key services to be taken away. Based on the information currently available, Councillor Eade said that the Council's preference was for Option 2. He emphasised that this was not a fight between Telford & Wrekin and Shropshire but about ensuring that services met the needs of these different communities.

RESOLVED - that the motion be agreed

53. CHANGES TO CABINET MEMBERSHIP

The Leader presented the report of the Head of Audit & Democracy. On the 28th October, 2008 the Leader of the Council had revised the composition of his Cabinet and had replaced Councillor Denis Allen as Cabinet Member for Community Services by Councillor Stephen Bentley, who had previously been the Cabinet Member for Environment. The Leader had appointed Councillor Miles Hosken as interim Cabinet Member for Environment and, in accordance with the Council's Constitution, this interim appointment required ratification by Council.

RESOLVED –

- a) **That Council ratified Councillor M.B. Hosken's interim appointment as the Cabinet Member for Environment**
- b) **That Council noted Councillor S. Bentley's change of Portfolio responsibilities to Cabinet Member for Community Services.**

54. REPORTS OF LEADER AND CABINET

(a) Report of Leader

Councillor A.J. Eade referred to the global economic downturn, pointing out that the Borough would not be immune from its effects. He forecast a tough year ahead and felt that early 2009 would reveal the full scope of the issues facing the Council. The local community would look to the Council and its Members to provide a lead in the difficult times ahead and confirmed that plans to reduce the level of Council Tax increases remained on target and that the policy of using financial balances to sustain Council budgets would be reduced. Both of these policies would be beneficial to the Council Tax payers of the Borough.

The Leader went on to discuss the role of the Council in helping people and businesses in the Borough during the financial downturn and appealed for the broad support of the Council on current projects. He referred to the government's Mortgage Support Scheme and said that the Council was keen to look at all measures that would stimulate the local housing market and, to this end confirmed that he would be meeting with the Homes and Community Agency in the near future. The Leader discussed a number of projects offering assistance with retraining, assisting the homeless and affordable warmth. In summary, he asked that political differences be put aside in order to ensure that the Council was able to deliver on these initiatives and concluded by telling Members that the community expected extraordinary action from this Council.

Report of Cabinet

The report of the Cabinet, setting out the matters determined between 29 September and 24 November, 2008 was received. Individual Cabinet Members reported on some of the key areas of work being undertaken by their Portfolios. These included the Borough Towns Grant Scheme, the post-16 provision for Campus Telford, the Scrutiny Review of Traffic Management in Conservation Areas, and the free swimming initiative.

RESOLVED – that the Cabinet report be noted.

55. WATER LANE PLANNING STATEMENT

Councillor M.B. Hosken, Cabinet Member: Environment presented the report of the Head of Planning & Environment which set out the Council's support for development and regeneration in Water Lane, Newport together with a description of some of the key planning and design policies and principles.

Councillor C.F. Smith expressed concern that the development was both close to a conservation area, which might lead to conflict with the developers, that the development area might be widened. Councillor M.B. Hosken thanked Councillor Smith for making a relevant point and agreed to keep him informed of developments. Councillor E.J. Carter, Cabinet Member for Regeneration, pointed out that the document was a Design Statement and that detailed plans would be submitted later. Councillor A.J. Stanton was supportive of developments that were of value and did not detract from the town of Newport and Councillor A.A. Mackenzie hoped that future plans would include social housing, as that was important for all areas of the Borough.

RESOLVED - That Council approved and adopted the Water Lane Planning Statement, attached as Appendix A of the report, for use in assessing planning applications which came forward in the Water Lane area and to encourage regeneration in Newport.

56. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM BOARDS, COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS

- a) Councillor M.B. Hosken presented the minutes of the meeting of the Council Constitution Committee held on 29th September, 2008, which contained a number of recommendations to Council.

Councillor W.L. Tomlinson asked that, in future, Council be notified of the names of Cabinet Assistants and their exact roles and Councillor U.E Sambrook asked that Cabinet Members notified all Members of the names and roles of Cabinet Assistants. The Cabinet Members agreed to provide the names and roles of Cabinet Assistants to all Members.

Councillor C.F. Smith, referring to recommendation (b), asked that any administrative amendments made under the Monitoring Officer's delegated authority be brought to the attention of Council as soon as practicable. He further requested, in reference to recommendation (e),

that a paper copy of the Constitution also be provided to all Members on request.

RESOLVED – that

- (a) the minor administrative amendments made to the Constitution as set out in Appendix A of the report be approved;
- (b) the granting of delegated authority to the Monitoring Officer, following consultation with the Speaker, to make future minor administrative amendments as necessary to update the Constitution be approved;
- (c) the amendments to Article 7 of the Constitution necessary to formalise the position of Cabinet Assistants, as set out in section 5 of the report be approved;
- (d) the addition of paragraph 7.09 to Article 7, as set out in the report, as follows be approved:

‘The number of Cabinet Assistants so appointed shall not exceed the number of Cabinet Members at any one time’;

- (e) the amendments to Article 16 – Suspension, Interpretation and Publication of the Constitution – as set out in section 6 of the report be approved;
 - (f) the amendments to the Access to Information Procedure Rules (Part 4, Section 2 of the Constitution) as set out in section 7 of the report be approved;
 - (g) the amendments to the Council Procedure Rules (Part 4, Section 1 of the Constitution) relating to Assembly Sessions as set out in paragraph 8.1 of the report be approved;
 - (h) the amendments to the Council Procedure Rules (Part 4, Section 1, paragraph 17 of the Constitution) required to allow for the introduction of electronic voting and the deletion of ballots as set out in paragraph 8.2 of the report, be approved.
- b) Councillor M.B. Hosken presented the minutes of the meeting of the Council Constitution Committee held on 10th November, 2008, which contained a number of recommendations to Council.

RESOLVED – that

- (a) the proposed changes to the Overview & Scrutiny Procedure Rules within the Constitution as summarised in the report and detailed in Appendices A and B be adopted;

(b) the proposed changes to the Policy Framework and Budget Procedure Rules within the Constitution, as summarised in the report and detailed in Appendix A be adopted.

c) Councillor A.J. Stanton, Vice-Chairman of the Standards Committee presented the minutes of the meeting held on 9 October, 2008, which contained a recommendation to Council.

RESOLVED – that the updated Corporate Anti-Fraud and Corruption Policy be adopted.

57. APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO SCRUTINY LEADERSHIP BOARD

The Speaker presented the report of the Head of Audit & Democracy which requested that Council appointed the members of the Scrutiny Leadership Board as from 1 January 2009. A list of nominations for the six seats was tabled at the meeting and approval was sought for the following five Members to be appointed until 9 May 2011:

Councillor R. Aveley
Councillor J.A. Francis
Councillor A.A. Meredith
Councillor D.R.W. White
Councillor A.A. Mackenzie

The sixth seat was (in accordance with current political balance) subject to rotation between TAWPA and the Liberal Democrat and Independent Groups.

The Speaker explained that the Leaders of the following three Groups had agreed these arrangements for rotating the seat between 1 January 2009 and 9 May 2011.

Helen Williams (TAWPA)	1 January 2009 to 13 October 2009
Gill Green (Independent)	14 October 2009 to 26 July 2010
Karen Tomlinson (Liberal Democrat)	27 July 2010 to 9 May 2011 (i.e. 4 days after election day)

The Speaker informed Members that the new Overview & Scrutiny Procedure Rules stated that members of the Leadership Board would be appointed for a two year period. However, as the Board was being established part way through the municipal year, it was proposed that the appointments would run until 9 May 2011. From May 2011 appointments would then revert to a two year period. In the event of the political balance of the Council being changed, the allocation of seats would be re-calculated. The Chairman of the Scrutiny Leadership Board would be an Opposition Group member and would be appointed for two years. This initial appointment would run until 9 May 2011.

RESOLVED – that

- (a) **the Members, as set out in the report, be appointed to the Scrutiny Leadership Board for the period 1 January, 2009 to 9 May, 2011;**
- (b) **That the term of membership for TAWPA, the Liberal Democrat Group and the Independent Group be as set out in paragraph 3.5 of the report;**
- (c) **it be noted that the Scrutiny Management Board and the four Scrutiny Commissions would cease to exist after 31 December 2008.**

58. MINUTES OF BOARDS, COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS

The Council received for noting the minutes of Scrutiny Commission 1 on 3 November 2008, Scrutiny Commission 2 on 4 November 2008, Scrutiny Commission 3 on 7 October and 5 November 2008, Scrutiny Commission 4 on 7 October and 6 November 2008, Scrutiny Management Board on 2 and 21 October 2008, Audit Committee on 16 September and 30 October 2008, Standards Committee on 9 October 2008, Plans Board on 3 and 24 September and 8 and 29 October 2008 and Licensing Committee on 22 September and 21 October 2008.

59. QUESTIONS

The following Questions were asked in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11:

- (a) **Councillor C.F. Smith asked:**

“Following the recent television news announcement that this Council is to install speed cameras will the Cabinet Member for Roads make a statement to Council as to which road is to have the cameras and where they will be sited?”

Councillor M.B. Hosken, Cabinet Member: Environment, gave the following response:

“The question is in fact incorrect as no such decision has been made and no such policy has been announced. I am, however, concerned about the number of injury accidents on the A442 as a whole making it a priority location for us to seek further solutions and improvements.

Average speed cameras may be one such option for us to assess so that we can identify what measures offer the best solution in terms of their potential to reduce accidents and provide good value for money.

It is unfortunate that the media coverage by the BBC chose to focus on the possible introduction of average speed cameras, as they came to the borough to talk to us about our wider work in road safety following recent statistics published by the Department for Transport which demonstrates that we are one of the top performing authorities for reducing fatal and serious injuries across the borough's road network.

For information, the number of fatal and serious injury accidents has reduced from an average of 8 per year before the safety measures on the A442 were introduced, over the last two years the average number of fatal and serious injuries has been 4 per year – over the same time the number of slight injuries has reduced from 119 to 57. It is however only right that we should investigate what options we have available to us to further reduce injury accidents on the A442.

However, I would stress that no firm decision has been taken about average speed cameras. “

- (b) **Councillor C.F. Smith asked:** “Can the Cabinet Member for the Environment inform Council what facilities exist for the collection and recycling of small dry batteries of the sort that are used in clocks, radios and children's toys?”

Councillor M.B. Hosken, Cabinet Member: Environment, gave the following response:

“We currently collect household (dry) batteries at all of the Community Recycling Centres. The batteries collected are taken for recycling and the chemical components, as well as the metal containment elements, are recovered. Where possible we would encourage residents to collect such batteries until they are taking a load of other waste to the Community Recycling Centre rather than make a special trip with just a few batteries.

We are aware that batteries do enter the residual waste stream. However, their effect is diluted throughout the waste mass currently being landfilled. The chemicals leaking out of the batteries in landfill are a component of the leachate produced but this is collected for treatment and is, therefore, not released to the local environment.

The Council has reviewed the potential to collect household batteries as part of the kerbside collection service. However, the nature of batteries means they would have to be treated as hazardous waste with significant implications for the collection vehicles, the reception points and the management of the service. The Council will continue to review its recycling services to ensure they remain efficient and effective.”

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11.3(e) Councillor C.F. Smith responded as follows:

“Are there any plans to increase the number of collection points and do these plans include provision for dealing with energy efficient light bulbs?”

Councillor M.B. Hosken agreed to provide a written response to this question.

(c) **Councillor A.D. McClements asked:**

“As part of this Council’s commitment to the regeneration of the Borough Centres, could the Cabinet Member for Regeneration give an assurance that Telford & Wrekin Council, together with continued funding from Wellington Town Council, provide the full financial support for the replacement of a Town Manager for Wellington?”

This role and support is now ever more urgent due to the recent news that Wellington has suffered three more shop closures in the past week.”

Councillor E.J. Carter, Cabinet Member: Regeneration, gave the following response:

“The Wellington Regeneration Support post was originally funded mainly by Advantage West Midlands monies through their Market Towns Initiative, which are due to expire in April 2009.

Wellington Partnership decided that they needed this role to continue and also to develop to handle all the promotional activities in Wellington and to put together a funding package in consultation with Wellington Town Council. As part of this initiative the Wellington Partnership approached the Borough Council to ascertain if the Borough Towns Grant Scheme could be used to part-fund this post. This was carefully examined by the Council and the Partnership was advised that using Borough Towns Grant Scheme for revenue purposes was not allowed under our Financial Regulations.

However, the Regeneration Partnership has subsequently developed a revised proposal that enables the funding of the post to be found from other sources with the Borough Towns Grant Scheme to support supplementary capital projects in Wellington. This proposal is currently being considered in principle with the aim of enabling both the appointment of a Town Manager and the regeneration projects to proceed.”

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11.3(e) Councillor McClements responded by asking when the project would start and Councillor Carter responded that discussions were currently taking place and that he expected the project to begin in the near future.

(d) **Councillor U.E. Sambrook asked:**

“Can the Cabinet Member for Community Services please clarify the position regarding the commitment made to STROWP in November 2007 to fund £47,460 over 5 years to facilitate a total potential investment coming in to the Borough of £474,600?”

Councillor S Bentley, Cabinet Member: Community Services gave the following response:

“I would like to meet with S.T.R.O.W.P. to discuss the matter and would like to help if this can be achieved within the budgetary process.”

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11.3(e) Councillor Sambrook responded that the bid for funding might fail if funding was not available. Councillor Bentley replied that he could not, as an individual Cabinet Member, approve funding as this would need to be considered as part of the budgetary process.

60. NOTICE OF MOTION

Councillor D.J. Allen moved, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 12, the following Motion:

“Gurkhas have played an active front line part in the British Army’s activities in times of war and peace for nearly 200 years, serving and fighting alongside citizens of this Borough in the service of Britain. In this period approximately 300,000 Gurkhas have fought alongside British soldiers, with 45,000 of them being either killed or wounded.

The Government announced in September 2004 a change in immigration rules that allowed Gurkhas who had served in the British Army to settle in Britain with their families.

This Council notes with concern, however, that this offer has only been extended to cover those Gurkhas who had served at least four years and been discharged after 1st July 1997.

Given the exceptional service that they have given to Britain, this Council is asked to support Gurkhas and their families being given fast track eligibility for either the right to remain or citizenship.

This Council, therefore:

- (i) Urges Telford & Wrekin Members of Parliament to support Early Day Motions that seek to extend Gurkhas rights;
- (ii) Agrees to write to the Prime Minister demanding that all retired Gurkhas who fought in the British Army get the right to citizenship as well as a fair deal on pensions.

The Motion was seconded by Councillor V.A. Fletcher who spoke of her dismay at the treatment of the Gurkhas. She felt that the Government should provide all UK service personnel and their families with proper care. Councillor R.K. Austin pointed out that the Member of Parliament for Telford had signed an Early Day Motion in the House of Commons supporting the legal right of all Gurkhas to stay in the UK.

RESOLVED – that the motion be agreed

The meeting ended at 9.03 p.m.

Speaker: _____

Date: _____

MAYORAL ENGAGEMENTS
26TH NOVEMBER 2008 – 23RD JANUARY 2009

November	26th	M	Attendance at Briefing and Tour of DCAE Cosford
	29th	M	Attendance at Remembrance Function Celebrating the longstanding Anglo Sikh Heritage, Handsworth, Birmingham
	30th	M	Attendance at Curry Lunch, Station Officers Mess, Donnington.
	2nd	M	Attendance at Helping Hand Xmas Party, Civilian Restaurant, MOD Donnington
December	4th	M	Attendance at Carol Service, Oakengates Theatre
	5th	M	Attendance at Dawley Lantern Parade, Dawley High Street
	6th	M	Attendance at Wrockwardine Wood & Trench Parish Council Senior Citizens Party, The Sutherland School, Trench
	7th	M	Attendance at Great Dawley Parish Council Senior Citizens Christmas Party, Park Inn Hotel
	8th	M	Attendance at Shropshire Fire & Rescue Annual Festival of Carols, St Mary's Church, Bridgnorth
	9th	M	Attendance at Pantomime, Grand Theatre, Wolverhampton
	10th	M	Attendance at Citizenship Ceremony, VIP Suite
		M	Opening Nrgize, Oakengates Leisure Centre
		M	Attendance at Charity Event, Highgate Brewery, Walsall
	12th	M	Attendance at Telford & Wrekin Arthritis Support Group Christmas Dinner, The Grays Hotel
	13th	M	Attendance at Community Service Award, The Malthouse, Ironbridge

- M** Attendance at Charity Concert, The Engine Shop, Coalbrookdale
- 14th** **M** And Mayoress attended Chairman's Carol Service, St John Evangelist RC Church, Bridgnorth
- M** Attendance at Community Carol Service, Wellington Methodist Church
- 17th** **M** Visit to Juniper Training Open Day, Hazeldine House
- 18th** **M** Attendance at Family Carol Service, St Nicholas Church, Newport
- 19th** **M** Visit to Royal Mail Sorting Offices at Tweedale & Oakengates
- January 2009** **14th** **M** Attendance at Prize Giving, AFC Telford United Learning Centre, Wellington
- 23rd** **M** Attendance at Royal Lancastrian Yeomanry Lunch, Officers Mess, Dawley Bank

TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL
COUNCIL – 29TH JANUARY, 2009
REPORT OF CABINET – FOR INFORMATION ONLY
MATTERS DETERMINED BY THE CABINET

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report provides sets out those matters determined by the Cabinet at its meetings on the 8th and 15th December, 2008 and the 12th January, 2009.

2.0 CABINET BUSINESS

Matters that have been determined by Cabinet are listed below:

8th December, 2008

- Review of Health Services in Shropshire and Telford & Wrekin
- Response to Scrutiny Commission Report - Review of Sale of Assets
- Service & Financial Planning 2009/10 to 2011/12
- Arts Strategy for Telford & Wrekin 2008/13
- National Non-Domestic Rural Rate Relief - Revision of Rural Settlement Boundaries
- Review of Risk Management Strategy 2008
- Adult Social Services Performance and Star Rating 2008
- Long Term Waste Treatment & Disposal Contract (exempt)
- Review of Telford & Wrekin Translation and Interpretation Services (exempt)

12th January, 2009

- Scrutiny Review of Footway Gating
- Vision 2026 Refresh
- Community Strategy – Reviewing Our Community Priorities & Partnership Structures
- Planning of School Places: Co-location of Three Oaks and Stirchley Primary Schools
- Business Continuity Management Strategy 2008
- Appointment to Outside Bodies
- Update on the Regeneration of the Sutton Hill Estate
- ‘Credit Crunch’ Advice Centre - Telford Town Centre (In accordance with paragraph 18 (a) and (b) of Section 5 of Part 4 (Rules of Procedure) of the Constitution, this item was dealt with

as an Urgent Decision not subject to Call-In with the agreement of the Chairman of the Scrutiny Leadership Board (exempt).

3.0 DELEGATION OF POWERS GRANTED BY THE CABINET

REPORT HEADING	DELEGATION GRANTED TO	DETAIL OF DELEGATION GRANTED
Free Swimming Initiative	Corporate Director: Community Services, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Services	To further explore opportunities to extend the scheme beyond the core offer for implementation from April 2009.
Planning of School Places: Stirchley Primary School and Three Oaks Primary School	Corporate Director: Children and Young People	To engage in formal consultation with key partners and stakeholders in respect of a proposal to merge and co-locate Stirchley Primary and Three Oaks Primary Schools into a new primary school.
Update on the Regeneration of the Sutton Hill Estate	Corporate Director: Environment & Regeneration in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Regeneration Corporate Director: Environment & Regeneration, after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Regeneration,	To commission studies associated with the local centre. To agree protocols for the determination of a small programme of immediate improvements on the estate, in consultation with local residents.
'Credit Crunch' Advice Centre – Telford Town Centre	Head of Asset & Property Management Head of Legal Services	To negotiate, agree and enter into the lease on behalf of the Council. To agree and execute all necessary documents in relation to the lease.
LEGAL COMMENT FINANCIAL COMMENT LINKS WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES RISKS AND OPPORTUNITIES ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT EQUALITY & DIVERSITY WARD IMPLICATIONS	As described in each report considered by Cabinet. Copies of all reports have been previously circulated to all Members of the Council	

TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL

COUNCIL MEETING – 29th JANUARY 2009

SETTING OF THE COUNCIL TAX BASE FOR 2009/10

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF FINANCE

1.0 PURPOSE

1.1 To determine the Council Tax Base for General and Special Fund purposes for the financial year 2009/10.

2.0 RESOLUTIONS

2.1 That the calculation of the tax base for 2009/10 as at 5.6 and Appendix 1 be approved;

2.2 In accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of Tax Base) Regulations 1992, the amount calculated for Telford and Wrekin Council Tax base for 2009/10 for its special fund area shall be as per the appropriate parish amounts detailed in Appendix 1.

3.0 SUMMARY

Council Tax Base

3.1 In order to determine the appropriate Council Tax levels for the district, it is necessary for the Council to determine the tax base for its area or part of its area. The budget requirements of the various precepting authorities are divided by this figure to arrive at the Band D equivalent level of Council Tax.

3.2 The determining of the tax base must be set between 1st December and 31st January in relation to 2009/10 as prescribed by the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992 as amended. The figures used for tax base allow for the continuation of the resolutions in respect of reducing the discounts for empty properties and second homes agreed previously.

4.0 PREVIOUS MINUTES

4.1 Council meeting 31st January 2008

5. COUNCIL TAX BASE INFORMATION

5.1 As members will be aware, the Council Tax is a banded capital value based property tax.

5.2 The main features of the tax are:-

- Each domestic property is allocated to one of 8 bands depending on its capital value which has been set by the Valuation Office Agency.
- Section 5 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 sets out the range of property values within each band. Associated Regulations determine the relationship between the tax rates for each band.
- A 25 % discount from the full charge is available for single adult households. Certain categories of resident are disregarded in deciding the number of adult residents. These include students, student nurses, youth training trainees, the severely mentally impaired etc. Qualifying criteria must be met before discounts or disregards are allowed.
- A reduction equivalent to one council tax band is available where a resident of a dwelling is disabled and certain facilities are required for meeting the needs of that disabled person. For Band A properties the reduction is equivalent to 5/9ths of the Band D Charge.
- Council Tax Benefit of up to 100% of the full charge is available for those on low incomes.
- The grant system is intended to take account of differences in the needs and taxable capacity of each area.

5.3 The Council Tax Bands range from A to H and the details are as follows:-

Band	House Value (as at April 1991 prices)	Band D Proportion	Telford & Wrekin Properties Spread	% Increase/ Decrease for 09/10
	£	%	%	%
A	Under 40,000	66.7	39.94	-0.13
B	40,001 – 52,000	77.8	26.23	+0.05
C	52,001 – 68,000	88.9	14.37	+0.01
D	68,001 – 88,000	100.0	10.89	+0.00
E	88,001 – 120,000	122.2	6.24	+0.02
F	120,001 – 160,000	144.4	2.82	+0.00
G	160,001 – 320,000	166.7	1.44	+0.05
H	Over 320,000	200.0	0.07	+0.00

5.4 Property Base

There are 67,615 properties in the valuation list for the Telford & Wrekin area. This compares with a figure of 67,222 in the list at the same time last year. There has been an increase of 393 properties, which equates to an increase of 0.6%. Overall there has been a decrease in the percentage of Band A properties and an increase in Band B, C, E and G properties, with the largest increase in Bands B & G.

5.5 Council Tax Base

To arrive at the Council Tax Base, it is necessary to undertake the following calculation in respect of each tax band:

Total number of chargeable dwellings
(Less) Dwellings subject to discounts
= (Equals)
Total equivalent number of properties
X (Multiplied by)
Ratio to Band D
= (Equals)
Relevant Amount (Band D Equivalent)

The relevant amounts for each tax band are then aggregated to arrive at the total for the area.

Finally, an estimated Collection Rate needs to be applied to the resultant figure. This has to be common to the whole area and has to provide for amendments to the Council Tax Banding List, appeals against banding, additional discounts and losses on collection. It is suggested that a figure of 99% be used.

5.6 General Fund Tax Base

This is the estimated tax base for the whole of the area and will be used by Telford & Wrekin to calculate its General Fund Council Tax levy and also by West Mercia Police Authority and the Shropshire Combined Fire Authority to calculate the levy in respect of their precepts.

The tax base for this purpose for 2009/10 is 50,752.5. Using an estimated collection rate of 99%, the tax base becomes **50,245.0**. The detailed build up to this figure by parish is shown in Appendix 1.

5.7 Special Fund Tax Base

This is the estimated base for the Special Fund area, i.e. those areas where Telford & Wrekin Council provides services which, in other areas, are provided by Parish Councils.

For 2009/10 it will be necessary to have two levels of special fund tax. The first tax will be levied on all the parishes in the Special Fund area. The second tax will be levied on those parishes who have opted not to take over responsibility for street lighting in their area.

The Special Fund Council Tax will be set in the full knowledge of the services provided by each individual parish and taking account of the tax base for each parish.

6.0 **EQUALITY & DIVERSITY**

There are no direct equality and diversity implications.

7.0 **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**

7.1 The prevalence of second homes within a community, which are not occupied for much of the time, can have a detrimental effect upon demand for local services such as bus services and rural businesses.

7.2 In respect of long term empty properties the discount after the first 6 months was removed in 2004 and should provide an incentive to owners to ensure properties don't remain empty for a sustained period of time. Some environmental and economic pressures are likely to be alleviated, assisting in the regeneration agenda and the shortage of housing generally in this area.

8.0 **LEGAL COMMENT**

Section 75(1) of the Local Government Act 2003 enabled the Secretary of State to prescribe by regulations classes of dwellings in England where a billing authority may change the level of council tax discount. The Council Tax (Prescribed Classes of Dwellings)(England) Regulations 2003 came into force on 18th December 2003. These regulations allow Billing Authorities to reduce the council tax discount given in respect of second homes to no less than 10% and that in respect of long term empty properties to nil.

9.0 **LINKS WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES**

Regeneration

10.0 OPPORTUNITIES & RISKS

The opportunities and risks associated with the report have been identified and assessed. Arrangements will be put in place to manage the risks and maximise the opportunities that have been identified.

11.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The Council Tax Base has a direct impact on the Council Tax that will be levied by the Council for 2009/10 and the level of revenue support grant the Council receives. To assess the full financial implications it is necessary to consider the Council's expenditure for 2009/10 and the grant settlement. These will be addressed in the Service and Financial Planning process for 2009/10.

12.0 WARD IMPLICATIONS

District Wide Implications

13.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS

Local Government Act 2003
CLG Calculation of Council Tax Base Return (CTB1) October 2008
The Council Tax (Prescribed Classes of Dwellings)(England) Regulations 2003

Report Prepared by Bernard Morris
Finance Manager
01952 383702
bernie.morris@telford.gov.uk

TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	25651	17733	9715	7364	4222	1908	977	45	67615
Class A to W exemptions	0	972	447	333	137	75	35	19	4	2022
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	24679	17286	9382	7227	4147	1873	958	41	65593
Disabled reductions	0	110	161	84	91	61	22	14	7	550
Effectively chargeable	110	161	84	91	61	22	14	7	0	550
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	110	24730	17209	9389	7197	4108	1865	951	34	65593
Single adult household 25% discount	23	11321	5577	2318	1161	529	201	89	4	21223
Resident disregarded 25% discount	5	159	132	94	65	21	9	5	0	490
2 adults disregard	2	11	8	10	9	4	3	8	1	56
2nd home disregard (not furnished)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zero discount	0	4	3	3	8	3	8	10	1	40
Total dwellings 50% discount	2	15	11	13	17	7	11	18	2	96
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	75	50	39	25	12	10	3	0	214
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	148	66	51	30	6	4	5	1	311
Entitled to no discounts	80	13160	11439	6925	5929	3539	1634	836	28	43570
Total equivalent dwellings	102.00	21,815.00	15,751.25	8,760.00	6,869.50	3,961.00	1,802.00	917.00	32.00	60,010
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	56.7	14,543.3	12,251.0	7,786.7	6,869.5	4,841.2	2,602.9	1,528.3	64.0	50,543.6
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										208.9
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 20 Total + Line 21)										50752.5
AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE										
COUNCIL TAX BASE					50245.0					

Chetwynd

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	16	44	21	17	43	42	36	4	223
Class A to W exemptions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	16	44	20	17	43	42	36	4	222
Disabled reductions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	5
Effectively chargeable	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	5
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	0	16	44	21	17	42	44	35	3	222
Single adult household 25% discount	0	13	11	6	1	10	8	4	1	54
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
2 adults disregard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
2nd home discount (not furnished)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
zero discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Entitled to no discounts	0	3	33	15	16	31	35	30	2	165
Total equivalent dwellings	0.00	12.75	41.25	19.50	16.75	39.25	41.50	33.50	2.75	207.25
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.0	8.5	32.1	17.3	16.8	48.0	59.9	55.8	5.5	243.9
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										243.9

AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE

COUNCIL TAX BASE

241.5

Chetwynd Aston

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	11	38	26	26	22	21	21	1	166
Class A to W exemptions	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	5
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	10	37	25	26	21	20	21	1	161
Disabled reductions	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	6
Effectively chargeable	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	6
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	0	10	37	26	27	21	19	20	1	161
Single adult household 25% discount	0	5	9	6	5	4	2	2	0	33
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
2 adults disregard	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
2nd home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
zero discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Entitled to no discounts	0	5	28	20	20	16	16	18	1	124
Total equivalent dwellings	0.00	8.75	34.75	24.50	25.25	19.50	18.00	19.50	1.00	151.25
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.0	5.8	27.0	21.8	25.3	23.8	26.0	32.5	2.0	164.2
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										164.2
AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE										
COUNCIL TAX BASE										162.6

Church Aston

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	24	212	84	56	110	27	31	2	546
Class A to W exemptions	0	3	7	3	1	4	0	0	0	18
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	21	205	81	55	106	27	31	2	528
Disabled reductions	0	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	5
Effectively chargeable	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	5
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	0	23	204	81	54	107	26	31	2	528
Single adult household 25% discount	0	14	62	17	9	17	5	4	0	128
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	3
2 adults discregard	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
2nd home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
zero discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
Entitled to no discounts	0	9	140	64	45	88	21	27	2	396
Total equivalent dwellings	0.00	19.50	187.75	76.75	51.75	102.25	24.75	30.00	2.00	494.75
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.0	13.0	146.0	68.2	51.8	125.0	35.8	50.0	4.0	493.7
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										493.7

AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE

COUNCIL TAX BASE

488.8

Dawley Hamlets

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	555	1092	516	287	119	52	31	1	2653
Class A to W exemptions	0	22	16	8	6	1	1	1	0	55
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	533	1076	508	281	118	51	30	1	2598
Disabled reductions	0	0	6	3	0	4	1	1	1	16
Effectively chargeable	0	6	3	0	4	1	1	1	0	16
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	0	539	1073	505	285	115	51	30	0	2598
Single adult household 25% discount	0	261	343	99	43	15	0	3	0	764
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	3	4	7	4	0	0	0	0	18
2 adults disregard	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
2nd home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
zero discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	3
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	6
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	4	4	1	0	1	0	1	0	11
Entitled to no discounts	0	274	724	397	237	100	51	24	0	1807
Total equivalent dwellings	0.00	476.50	985.25	477.50	272.75	111.25	51.00	27.75	0.00	2,402.00
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.0	317.7	766.3	424.4	272.8	136.0	73.7	46.3	0.0	2,034.5
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										2034.5
AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE										
COUNCIL TAX BASE										2014.2

Edgmond

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	20	121	142	102	92	69	37	3	586
Class A to W exemptions	0	5	20	7	4	3	6	1	1	47
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	15	101	135	98	89	63	36	2	539
Disabled reductions	0	0	0	1	3	2	3	0	0	9
Effectively chargeable	0	0	1	3	2	3	0	0	0	9
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	0	15	102	137	97	90	60	36	2	539
Single adult household 25% discount	0	7	31	36	14	24	8	5	0	125
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	4
2 adults disregard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2nd home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
zero discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Entitled to no discounts	0	8	70	101	79	66	51	31	2	408
Total equivalent dwellings	0.00	13.25	94.00	128.00	92.25	84.00	57.50	34.75	2.00	505.75
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.0	8.8	73.1	113.8	92.3	102.7	83.1	57.9	4.0	535.7
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										535.7
AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE										
COUNCIL TAX BASE										530.3

Ercall Magna

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	91	186	168	120	58	38	42	4	707
Class A to W exemptions	0	5	2	4	1	1	0	0	0	13
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	86	184	164	119	57	38	42	4	694
Disabled reductions	0	1	3	1	3	2	0	1	1	12
Effectively chargeable	1	3	1	3	2	0	1	1	0	12
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	1	88	182	166	118	55	39	42	3	694
Single adult household 25% discount	0	48	59	43	19	8	9	5	0	191
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	1	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	7
2 adults disregard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
2nd home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
zero discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	4
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	5
Entitled to no discounts	1	39	119	120	97	47	30	35	2	490
Total equivalent dwellings	1.00	75.75	166.00	158.25	112.50	53.00	36.75	39.75	2.50	645.50
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.6	50.5	129.1	140.7	112.5	64.8	53.1	66.3	5.0	619.0
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										619.0

AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE

COUNCIL TAX BASE 612.8

Eyton

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	0	4	11	1	4	7	5	1	33
Class A to W exemptions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	0	4	10	1	4	7	5	1	32
Disabled reductions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Effectively chargeable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	0	0	4	10	1	4	7	5	1	32
Single adult household 25% discount	0	0	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	5
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 adults disregard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2nd home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
zero discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Entitled to no discounts	0	0	3	8	0	4	6	5	1	27
Total equivalent dwellings	0.00	0.00	3.75	9.50	0.75	4.00	6.75	5.00	1.00	30.75
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.0	0.0	2.9	8.4	0.8	4.9	9.7	8.3	2.0	37.0
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										37.0
AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE										
COUNCIL TAX BASE										36.7

The Gorge

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	158	233	311	257	196	79	38	1	1273
Class A to W exemptions	0	7	11	6	7	6	2	1	0	40
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	151	222	305	250	190	77	37	1	1233
Disabled reductions	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	5
Effectively chargeable	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	5
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	0	152	224	302	250	190	78	36	1	1233
Single adult household 25% discount	0	81	74	70	60	26	10	5	1	327
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	4
2 adults disregard	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
2nd home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
zero discount	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	4
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	4	5	9	5	3	0	0	0	26
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	4	2	7	3	0	1	0	0	17
Entitled to no discounts	0	67	144	221	183	158	68	31	0	872
Total equivalent dwellings	0.00	129.75	202.75	279.25	231.75	180.75	75.50	34.75	0.75	1,135.25
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.0	86.5	157.7	248.2	231.8	220.9	109.1	57.9	1.5	1,113.6
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										1113.6
AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE										
COUNCIL TAX BASE										1102.4

Great Dawley

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	3200	1049	378	264	56	9	8	0	4964
Class A to W exemptions	0	80	29	9	4	2	0	1	0	125
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	3120	1020	369	260	54	9	7	0	4839
Disabled reductions	0	14	11	6	1	1	0	0	0	33
Effectively chargeable	14	11	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	33
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	14	3117	1015	364	260	53	9	7	0	4839
Single adult household 25% discount	4	1472	338	79	40	5	4	0	0	1942
Resident disregarded 25% discount	1	21	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	30
2 adults disregard	0	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	6
2nd home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
zero discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	6
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	5
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	14	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	17
Entitled to no discounts	9	1618	673	279	218	48	4	7	0	2856
Total equivalent dwellings	12.75	2,740.75	929.50	342.25	249.00	51.75	7.00	7.00	0.00	4,340.00
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	7.1	1827.2	722.9	304.2	249.0	63.3	10.1	11.7	0.0	3,195.4
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										3195.4
AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE										
COUNCIL TAX BASE										3163.5

Hadley & Leegomery

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	2122	1353	692	697	334	165	76	0	5439
Class A to W exemptions	0	122	27	14	10	2	1	0	0	176
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	2000	1326	678	687	332	164	76	0	5263
Disabled reductions	0	12	16	4	6	2	0	0	0	40
Effectively chargeable	12	16	4	6	2	0	0	0	0	40
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	12	2004	1314	680	683	330	164	76	0	5263
Single adult household 25% discount	2	869	451	180	80	42	15	3	0	1642
Resident disregarded 25% discount	1	15	6	7	8	0	0	0	0	37
2 adults disregard	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
2nd home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
zero discount	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	4
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	4	9	3	1	3	0	0	0	20
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	14	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	24
Entitled to no discounts	9	1115	848	490	592	284	149	73	0	3560
Total equivalent dwellings	11.25	1,780.50	1,195.25	631.75	659.50	317.50	160.25	75.25	0.00	4,831.25
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	6.3	1187.0	929.6	561.6	659.5	388.1	231.5	125.4	0.0	4,089.0
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										4089.0
AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE										
COUNCIL TAX BASE										4048.1

Hollinswood & Randlay

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	1514	471	175	158	56	1	0	0	2375
Class A to W exemptions	0	45	4	3	2	1	0	0	0	55
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	1469	467	172	156	55	1	0	0	2320
Disabled reductions	0	9	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	15
Effectively chargeable	9	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	15
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	9	1463	466	170	157	54	1	0	0	2320
Single adult household 25% discount	1	577	102	23	27	4	0	0	0	734
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	13	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	19
2 adults disregard	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
2nd home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
zero discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Entitled to no discounts	8	872	360	144	129	50	1	0	0	1564
Total equivalent dwellings	8.75	1,315.00	439.25	163.25	150.00	53.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	2,130.25
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	4.9	876.7	341.6	145.1	150.0	64.8	1.4	0.0	0.0	1,584.5
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										1584.5
AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE										
COUNCIL TAX BASE										1568.7

Ketley

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	494	612	259	124	45	13	4	0	1551
Class A to W exemptions	0	15	10	5	0	1	0	0	0	31
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	479	602	254	124	44	13	4	0	1520
Disabled reductions	0	1	1	1	4	2	0	0	0	9
Effectively chargeable	1	1	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	9
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	1	479	602	257	122	42	13	4	0	1520
Single adult household 25% discount	0	222	167	56	23	6	1	1	0	476
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	0	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	11
2 adults disregard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2nd home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
zero discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	4
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	7	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	11
Entitled to no discounts	1	256	426	197	99	36	11	3	0	1029
Total equivalent dwellings	1.00	423.00	557.50	242.00	116.25	40.50	12.25	3.75	0.00	1,396.25
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.6	282.0	433.6	215.1	116.3	49.5	17.7	6.3	0.0	1,121.10
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										1121.1
AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE										
COUNCIL TAX BASE										1109.9

Kynnersley

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	5	21	10	18	13	6	7	0	80
Class A to W exemptions	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	4	20	10	18	13	6	7	0	78
Disabled reductions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Effectively chargeable	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	0	4	20	10	18	13	7	6	0	78
Single adult household 25% discount	0	1	7	3	2	2	0	0	0	15
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
2 adults disregard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2nd home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
zero discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Entitled to no discounts	0	3	13	7	16	10	7	6	0	62
Total equivalent dwellings	0.00	3.75	18.25	9.25	17.50	12.25	7.00	6.00	0.00	74.00
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.0	2.5	14.2	8.2	17.5	15.0	10.1	10.0	0.0	77.5
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										77.5
AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE										
COUNCIL TAX BASE										76.7

Lawley & Overdale

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	712	556	424	543	197	43	9	1	2485
Class A to W exemptions	0	29	12	7	4	9	0	0	0	61
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	683	544	417	539	188	43	9	1	2424
Disabled reductions	0	4	1	3	6	3	0	0	0	17
Effectively chargeable	4	1	3	6	3	0	0	0	0	17
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	4	680	546	420	536	185	43	9	1	2424
Single adult household 25% discount	1	320	196	101	71	16	1	1	1	708
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	2	2	2	3	1	0	0	0	10
2 adults disregard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2nd home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
zero discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	2	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	6
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	1	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	7
Entitled to no discounts	3	356	347	315	462	167	42	8	0	1700
Total equivalent dwellings	3.75	598.50	496.00	393.25	517.50	180.25	42.75	8.75	0.75	2,241.50
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	2.1	399.0	385.8	349.6	517.5	220.3	61.8	14.6	1.5	1,952.1
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										1952.1
AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE										
COUNCIL TAX BASE										1932.5

Lilleshall & Donnington

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	2431	1308	779	692	382	143	71	1	5807
Class A to W exemptions	0	75	67	17	34	9	11	6	1	220
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	2356	1241	762	658	373	132	65	0	5587
Disabled reductions	0	15	20	7	6	7	5	1	0	61
Effectively chargeable	15	20	7	6	7	5	1	0	0	61
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	15	2361	1228	761	659	371	128	64	0	5587
Single adult household 25% discount	1	982	415	193	88	28	14	4	0	1725
Resident disregarded 25% discount	2	18	12	6	1	1	0	2	0	42
2 adults disregard	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	4
2nd home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
zero discount	0	0	1	1	3	0	1	0	0	6
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	1	1	1	6	0	1	0	0	10
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	6	4	3	2	1	1	0	0	17
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	14	5	5	2	0	1	0	0	27
Entitled to no discounts	12	1354	796	558	562	341	112	58	0	3793
Total equivalent dwellings	14.25	2,107.50	1,118.75	709.25	632.75	363.25	123.50	62.50	0.00	5,131.75
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	7.9	1405.0	870.1	630.4	632.8	444.0	178.4	104.2	0.0	4,272.8
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										92.6
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										4365.4
AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE										
COUNCIL TAX BASE					4321.7					

Madeley

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	5209	1088	505	450	163	45	37	2	7499
Class A to W exemptions	0	141	24	8	2	2	1	0	0	178
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	5068	1064	497	448	161	44	37	2	7321
Disabled reductions	0	22	12	8	8	2	0	1	2	55
Effectively chargeable	22	12	8	8	2	0	1	2	0	55
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	22	5058	1060	497	442	159	45	38	0	7321
Single adult household 25% discount	5	2224	325	105	65	20	3	3	0	2750
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	22	8	7	5	1	0	0	0	43
2 adults disregard	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
2nd home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
zero discount	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	6
Total dwellings 50% discount	2	3	0	0	1	0	2	3	0	11
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	23	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	31
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	23	5	2	1	0	0	1	0	32
Entitled to no discounts	15	2786	723	383	369	138	40	32	0	4486
Total equivalent dwellings	19.75	4,483.50	974.75	468.00	423.10	153.75	43.25	35.75	0.00	6,601.85
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	11.0	2989.0	758.1	416.0	423.1	187.9	62.5	59.6	0.0	4,907.2
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										4907.2
AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE										
COUNCIL TAX BASE										4858.1

Newport

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	735	1356	1345	792	377	112	28	3	4748
Class A to W exemptions	0	34	70	48	27	6	4	0	0	189
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	701	1286	1297	765	371	108	28	3	4559
Disabled reductions	0	2	16	5	12	2	0	2	2	41
Effectively chargeable	2	16	5	12	2	0	2	2	0	41
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	2	715	1275	1304	755	369	110	28	1	4559
Single adult household 25% discount	2	449	473	385	125	41	5	5	0	1485
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	6	11	11	13	2	3	0	0	46
2 adults disregard	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	6
2nd home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
zero discount	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	5
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	3	1	1	1	0	2	3	0	11
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	4	4	8	2	0	0	0	0	18
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	3	7	4	1	0	0	0	1	16
Entitled to no discounts	0	253	786	899	614	326	100	20	1	2999
Total equivalent dwellings	1.50	597.75	1,151.50	1,200.50	719.00	358.25	107.00	25.25	1.00	4,161.75
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.8	398.5	895.6	1067.1	719.0	437.9	154.6	42.1	2.0	3,717.6
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										3717.6
AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE										
COUNCIL TAX BASE										3680.4

Oakengates

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	1310	1549	523	211	44	6	7	0	3650
Class A to W exemptions	0	54	33	10	1	2	0	0	0	100
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	1256	1516	513	210	42	6	7	0	3550
Disabled reductions	0	5	15	5	3	0	0	0	0	28
Effectively chargeable	5	15	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	28
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	5	1266	1506	511	207	42	6	7	0	3550
Single adult household 25% discount	1	594	457	124	37	3	0	0	0	1216
Resident disregarded 25% discount	1	8	10	6	2	0	0	0	0	27
2 adults disregard	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	4
2nd home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
zero discount	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	6
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	9	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	12
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	3	8	1	1	0	0	0	0	13
Entitled to no discounts	3	653	1037	378	168	38	6	6	0	2289
Total equivalent dwellings	4.50	1,109.50	1,388.25	477.00	197.25	40.75	6.00	6.50	0.00	3,229.75
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	2.5	739.7	1079.8	424.0	197.3	49.8	8.7	10.8	0.0	2,512.6
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										2512.6
AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE										
COUNCIL TAX BASE					2487.5					

Preston

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	0	21	10	14	17	15	11	0	88
Class A to W exemptions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	0	21	10	14	17	15	10	0	87
Disabled reductions	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Effectively chargeable	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	0	1	21	9	14	17	15	10	0	87
Single adult household 25% discount	0	1	6	3	2	2	0	1	0	15
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 adults disregard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2nd home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
zero discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	3
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Entitled to no discounts	0	0	15	6	12	13	14	9	0	69
Total equivalent dwellings	0.00	0.75	19.50	8.25	13.50	15.50	14.50	9.75	0.00	81.75
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.0	0.5	15.2	7.3	13.5	18.9	20.9	16.3	0.0	92.6
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										92.6

AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE

COUNCIL TAX BASE

91.7

Roddington

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	21	56	61	63	59	49	29	0	338
Class A to W exemptions	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	19	55	61	63	59	49	29	0	335
Disabled reductions	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Effectively chargeable	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	0	19	55	62	62	60	48	29	0	335
Single adult household 25% discount	0	7	16	14	10	8	11	2	0	68
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
2 adults disregard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2nd home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
zero discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Entitled to no discounts	0	12	39	47	51	51	37	27	0	264
Total equivalent dwellings	0.00	17.25	51.00	58.25	59.25	57.75	45.25	28.50	0.00	317.25
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.0	11.5	39.7	51.8	59.3	70.6	65.4	47.5	0.0	345.8
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										345.8
AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE										
COUNCIL TAX BASE										342.3

St Georges & Priorslee

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	900	1197	503	690	682	382	99	1	4454
Class A to W exemptions	0	30	21	11	12	10	2	1	0	87
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	870	1176	492	678	672	380	98	1	4367
Disabled reductions	0	2	9	2	8	5	4	1	0	31
Effectively chargeable	2	9	2	8	5	4	1	0	0	31
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	2	877	1169	498	675	671	377	97	1	4367
Single adult household 25% discount	1	456	416	115	123	83	37	7	0	1238
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	3	11	7	5	5	2	1	0	34
2 adults disregard	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	5
2nd home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
zero discount	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	1	0	2	2	0	1	1	1	8
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	3	3	5	7	0	0	0	0	18
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	6	6	3	3	0	1	0	0	19
Entitled to no discounts	1	414	739	369	538	583	337	88	0	3069
Total equivalent dwellings	1.75	760.25	1,060.75	464.00	638.50	649.00	366.75	94.50	0.50	4,036.00
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	1.0	506.8	825.0	412.4	638.5	793.2	529.7	157.5	1.0	3,865.1
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										3865.1
AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE										
COUNCIL TAX BASE										3826.4

Stirchley & Brookside

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	2599	759	348	270	116	26	4	0	4122
Class A to W exemptions	0	73	13	5	2	1	1	0	0	95
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	2526	746	343	268	115	25	4	0	4027
Disabled reductions	0	13	9	6	2	4	0	1	0	35
Effectively chargeable	13	9	6	2	4	0	1	0	0	35
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	13	2522	743	339	270	111	26	3	0	4027
Single adult household 25% discount	3	1061	199	63	33	14	4	2	0	1379
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	14	7	6	5	0	0	0	0	32
2 adults disregard	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
2nd home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
zero discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Entitled to no discounts	10	1445	536	269	231	97	22	0	0	2610
Total equivalent dwellings	12.25	2,252.25	691.00	321.25	260.00	107.50	25.00	2.00	0.00	3,671.25
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	6.8	1501.5	537.4	285.6	260.0	131.4	36.1	3.3	0.0	2,762.1
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										2762.1
AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE										
COUNCIL TAX BASE										2734.5

Tibberton & Cherrington

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	8	78	27	26	45	40	39	2	265
Class A to W exemptions	0	0	4	2	0	3	1	0	0	10
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	8	74	25	26	42	39	39	2	255
Disabled reductions	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	3
Effectively chargeable	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	0	9	73	26	26	41	39	39	2	255
Single adult household 25% discount	0	5	19	5	6	4	6	2	1	48
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
2 adults disregard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2nd home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
zero discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Entitled to no discounts	0	4	52	20	20	37	33	37	1	204
Total equivalent dwellings	0.00	7.75	67.50	24.50	24.50	40.00	37.50	38.50	1.75	242.00
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.0	5.2	52.5	21.8	24.5	48.9	54.2	64.2	3.5	274.8
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										274.8
AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE										
COUNCIL TAX BASE										272.1

Waters Upton

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	21	43	74	61	78	64	31	6	378
Class A to W exemptions	0	3	2	2	2	1	1	0	0	11
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	18	41	72	59	77	63	31	6	367
Disabled reductions	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Effectively chargeable	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	0	18	41	73	58	78	62	31	6	367
Single adult household 25% discount	0	11	10	18	12	11	5	2	0	69
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
2 adults disregard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
2nd home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
zero discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Entitled to no discounts	0	6	30	55	45	67	57	28	6	294
Total equivalent dwellings	0.00	14.75	38.00	68.50	54.75	75.25	60.75	30.00	6.00	348.00
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.0	9.8	29.6	60.9	54.8	92.0	87.8	50.0	12.0	396.8
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										396.8
AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE										
COUNCIL TAX BASE										392.8

Wellington

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	2564	3087	1429	1092	601	256	132	2	9163
Class A to W exemptions	0	198	53	28	11	6	3	6	1	306
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	2366	3034	1401	1081	595	253	126	1	8857
Disabled reductions	0	4	23	17	17	16	2	1	0	80
Effectively chargeable	4	23	17	17	16	2	1	0	0	80
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	4	2385	3028	1401	1080	581	252	125	1	8857
Single adult household 25% discount	1	1239	1058	392	219	88	31	11	0	3039
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	21	30	15	9	3	2	1	0	81
2 adults disregard	0	0	4	2	1	2	1	3	0	13
2nd home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
zero discount	0	1	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	7
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	1	5	3	1	3	3	4	0	20
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	7	10	1	2	1	1	0	0	22
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	34	6	9	5	4	1	2	0	61
Entitled to no discounts	3	1117	1925	990	849	486	215	109	1	5695
Total equivalent dwellings	3.75	2,066.00	2,748.50	1,297.25	1,021.50	556.25	241.80	120.00	1.00	8,056.05
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	2.1	1377.3	2137.7	1153.1	1021.5	679.9	349.3	200.0	2.0	6,922.9
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										6922.9
AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE										
COUNCIL TAX BASE										6853.6

Little Wenlock

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	6	43	35	30	42	38	28	1	223
Class A to W exemptions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	5	43	35	30	42	38	28	1	222
Disabled reductions	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	4
Effectively chargeable	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	0	6	44	33	30	43	37	28	1	222
Single adult household 25% discount	0	2	13	9	5	4	5	4	0	42
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	5
2 adults disregard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2nd home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
zero discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Entitled to no discounts	0	4	30	23	25	38	30	23	1	174
Total equivalent dwellings	0.00	5.50	40.50	30.50	28.75	41.75	35.00	26.75	1.00	209.75
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.0	3.7	31.5	27.1	28.8	51.0	50.6	44.6	2.0	239.3
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										0.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										239.3
AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE										
COUNCIL TAX BASE										236.9

Wrockwardine

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	67	232	443	224	244	156	115	9	1490
Class A to W exemptions	0	7	6	4	5	4	0	1	1	28
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	60	226	439	219	240	156	114	8	1462
Disabled reductions	0	0	0	3	3	4	1	0	0	11
Effectively chargeable	0	0	3	3	4	1	0	0	0	11
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	0	60	229	439	220	237	155	114	8	1462
Single adult household 25% discount	0	29	88	102	32	40	15	13	0	319
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	4
2 adults disregard	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
2nd home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
zero discount	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	1	0	7
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	3	3	4	2	0	0	1	0	13
Entitled to no discounts	0	29	138	336	187	196	136	100	8	1130
Total equivalent dwellings	0.00	51.75	205.75	413.25	211.50	226.75	149.50	110.25	8.00	1,376.75
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	0.0	34.5	160.0	367.3	211.5	277.1	215.9	183.8	16.0	1,466.1
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										7.0
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										1473.1
AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE										
COUNCIL TAX BASE										1458.5

Wrockwardine Wood & Trench

Dwellings on Valuation List	Band @	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total
Total number of dwellings	0	858	924	416	79	27	4	1	0	2309
Class A to W exemptions	0	19	13	129	2	0	0	0	0	163
Diplomats's dwellings / Demol.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chargeable dwellings	0	839	911	287	77	27	4	1	0	2146
Disabled reductions	0	6	10	3	3	0	0	0	0	22
Effectively chargeable	6	10	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	22
Adjusted chargeable dwellings	6	843	904	287	74	27	4	1	0	2146
Single adult household 25% discount	1	371	231	69	9	4	1	0	0	686
Resident disregarded 25% discount	0	12	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	23
2 adults disregard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2nd home discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
zero discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total dwellings 50% discount	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10%-50% discount PCLBB	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Long-term empty 0% discount-PCLCC	0	5	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	11
Entitled to no discounts	5	458	665	214	65	23	3	1	0	1434
Total equivalent dwellings	5.75	746.25	844.25	268.50	71.75	26.00	3.75	1.00	0.00	1,967.25
Ratio to band D	5 / 9	6 / 9	7 / 9	8 / 9	9 / 9	11 / 9	13 / 9	15 / 9	18 / 9	
Band D equivalents	3.2	497.5	656.6	238.7	71.8	31.8	5.4	1.7	0.0	1,506.7
Number of Band D equivalents of contributions in lieu (in respect of Class O dwellings)										109.3
Taxbase for revenue Support Grant purposes (Line 21 Total + Line 22)										1616.0
AT 99.00% ESTIMATED COLLECTION RATE										
COUNCIL TAX BASE										1599.8

PLANS BOARD

Minutes of a meeting of the Plans Board held on Wednesday, 19th November, 2008 at 6.00 p.m. in the Civic Offices, Telford

PRESENT: Councillors I.T.W. Fletcher (Chairman), R.G. Chaplin, J.A. Francis, G.M. Green, A.A. Meredith (Vice-Chairman), F.R. Picken, H. Rhodes and M.J. Smith

ALSO PRESENT:

Councillor K.T. Blundell (planning application W2008/1038) and Councillors V. Tonks and H. Williams (planning application W2007/1254)

PB-53 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Plans Board held on 29th October, 2008 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

PB-54 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None.

PB-55 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor I.T.W. Fletcher declared a personal and prejudicial interest in planning application W2008/1006 and indicated his intention to leave the room during discussion thereon.

Councillor F.R. Picken declared a personal interest in planning application W2008/1006 and indicated his intention to leave the room during discussion thereon.

PB-56 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

- (a) W2007/1254 – Plot E, Pool Hill/Doseley Road, Dawley, Telford, Shropshire

This was an outline application by English Partnerships (EP) for residential development on a plot of land, approximately 1.21 ha in size, to the east of Doseley Road and north of Pool Hill, Dawley. It was irregular in shape and the steeply sloping nature of the highest parts to the north and east would require substantial earthworks to provide suitable development platforms. The site had the benefit of an extant S7(i) approval under the New Towns Act but EP had now agreed to submit new planning applications for all of their undeveloped sites in order to take account of recent changes in legislation and government guidance. The site is also shown as a housing site in the Wrekin Local Plan.

Members were informed that a revised Urban Design Concept Plan had now been received, as tabled. This was still based upon the amended plans as sent out with the agenda but clarified the proposals. The revised Plan demonstrated that the site could accommodate thirty-five dwellings if one apartment block at the northern end of the site was only two storeys in height. Should the block be three storeys in height or differently configured in terms of the size of the dwellings, then the total number could increase; the applicant was now suggesting a range of development of between thirty-three and thirty-seven dwellings. The remainder of the development would be a mixture of detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings with the development areas being linked by a footpath running north to south.

A desk top study had been carried out to consider the potential issues of land contamination, shallow mining, existing mineshafts and land stability. There were four mineshafts within the site and two close by, which would restrict the area available for development. These shafts had been plugged but not capped and it would be necessary to provide an appropriate stand-off. As this was an area of shallow mine workings and the former site of a gasworks, there could be some associated land contamination and further investigation would be necessary. Radon gas was present on the site, which would be dealt with through an appropriate condition, as shown on the tabled update report.

The Highways Officer had no objections in principle to the development, subject to the provision of two suitable access points of Doseley Road and the provision of a two metre wide footpath along Doseley Road to link the development to the existing footpath network to Dawley Centre. A contribution of £12,000 had been agreed for improvements to the footpaths to the nearby primary and secondary schools.

In terms of drainage the site was likely to be unsuitable for the use of soakaways and alternative methods to reduce surface water flows would be required before it entered the sewers in Duckett Drive. The flood risk assessment had suggested that some form of intervention might be required to limit surface water from outside the site, particularly to the north, and therefore, surface water drainage issues would need to be carefully considered at the reserved matters stage.

In order to accord with Policies LR4 and LR6 of the Wrekin Local Plan the applicants had agreed to pay a contribution of £600 per dwelling to be used to improve/upgrade nearby play provision at Dawley Park. The Council's Housing Section had suggested that provision be made for affordable housing on the site and, given the difficult ground conditions and the cost of remediation, 22.5% affordable housing had been agreed, which would provide eight affordable houses. This would be split on the basis of 10% shared ownership and 12.5% social rented. As the potential number of dwellings on the site had now been reduced by the applicants, the Council had reconsidered the contribution required to offset the development of primary education and this had now been agreed at £1,250 per dwelling excluding any one-bedroom dwellings.

Great Dawley Parish Council had expressed concerns over the proposed number of new dwellings given that the site was on a dangerous road sited on a steep hill with no traffic calming measures. Eight letters of objection had been received from households close to the site and a petition with eleven names objecting to the development. The main points of concern were set out in the report.

On balance officers were of the view that the site was suitable for residential development provided that appropriate account was taken of the levels, mineshafts, potential contamination, highway requirements and drainage. These issues could be covered by appropriate planning conditions. The suggested layout would provide an appropriate and acceptable response to the constraints of the site and to the opportunities provided.

Councillor Helen Williams, one of the Ward Members for Dawley Magna, was invited to speak to the Board and outlined her concerns. Pool Hill was an unlined, single track road, with a blind bend at one point, which was used by children on their way to and from local schools and other local facilities. The Parish Council was currently seeking to have it designated a Safe Route to School with access restricted to residents. Therefore, the additional traffic resulting from this application would increase the existing road safety issues. In addition, there were existing drainage problems in the in the Duckett Road area, which would also be exacerbated by additional dwellings. In view of these comments, Members agreed that a Site Visit be made before the application was determined.

RESOLVED – that planning application W2007/1254 be deferred to the next meeting of the Board to give Members the opportunity to make a site visit.

(Councillors I.T.W. Fletcher and F.R. Picken left the room prior to discussion of the following application in accordance with their previously declared interests. The Chair was taken by Councillor A.A. Meredith, Vice-Chairman of the Board.)

(b) W2008/1006 – Former Windsor Flats, Arleston Lane, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire

This application was in respect of the demolition of the existing Windsor Flats and the redevelopment of the site with a combination of eleven two bedroom flats, three three-bedroom houses and a four-bedroom house to provide a total of twenty units.

Subsequent to the despatch of the agenda, an objection had been received from the owner of the adjacent BT site, who had produced documentary evidence to show that they had a permanent right of access across the site. Their objection was on the grounds that the proposed scheme would prejudice their right to cross and re-cross the site to access their land. In response the architects had slightly revised the layout of the site to allow

direct access into the neighbouring land and it was now considered that the revised layout resulted in a satisfactory layout whilst facilitating appropriate access onto the adjacent land.

Additional information had also been submitted in respect of the ground stability of the site but the Council's Geotechnical Officer was now satisfied that, subject to conditions in respect of the design of the foundations of the property and the retaining wall to the car park together with a condition on the nature of material infilling the site, the development could proceed.

It was recommended that additional conditions, as tabled, be attached to the planning permission to take account of the additional information submitted relating to site access, ground stability together with the proximity of the proposed dwellings to the Holyhead Road, which would require noise alleviation measures.

It was considered that the proposed development was in accordance with national and local planning policies being a previously developed site. The existing structure on the site was a three storey building with a flat roof with little or no architectural features other than the window themselves and a brick course in between the first and second floors. The proposed elevation to Bennetts Bank would present an asymmetrically designed property rising to four storeys on the eastern end and down to a three-storey structure on the western side. There would be infill panels between the windows and the central service would be in set slightly to help to break up the massive brickwork at the front. The walls would be a combination of light buff brick, off-white render and cedar panels and there was to be a sedum roof. This combination was felt to provide visual character to the building so complementing that of the surrounding area. The proposed layout optimised the number of apartments that could be provided on the site whilst at the same time minimising the impact to the neighbouring properties on the western boundary. In this respect it was considered that the proposal complemented Policy UD6 and the corridor designation fronting the site. In respect of the other elevations fronting the public domain, given the boundary treatments to the east and west, the site was relatively independent from its neighbours on either side and would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the area.

As part of the development proposal, the parking arrangements had been amended to include additional parking spaces to the eastern side of the site, which would necessitate cutting into the adjacent bank and the removal of some of the trees above. The Council's Arboricultural Officer considered that these trees did not have any particular value but that a landscaping scheme to plant replacements would be appropriate.

The Council's Highways Engineer had raised concerns on a number of matters, as set out in the report but, following amendments to the scheme by the applicants, these concerns had now been addressed. The Council's Outdoor Recreation Officer had raised concerns regarding the loss of the provisional play space detailed on-site in the original drawing, which was to be

removed to facilitate additional parking. The update report tabled at the meeting informed the Board that a Section 106 Agreement for a contribution of £12,000 (£600 per dwelling) had now been agreed in lieu of the provision of on-site play space.

Members welcomed the proposal for a development which would be of benefit to the site and its surrounding area.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application W2008/1006 the Head of Planning & Environment be granted delegated authority to grant planning permission subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement to provide a financial contribution of £12,000 towards outdoor recreation provision and to the amended conditions set out in the report update tabled at the meeting.

(c) W2008/1033 – Pear Tree Bridge Inn, Holyhead Road, Oakengates, Telford, Shropshire

This application was in respect of the change of use of the former public house into six one-bedroom flats and the erection of two semi-detached houses on land to the rear and a new block containing four two-bedroom flats on land to the side together with associated external works. The site, which lay on the corner of Holyhead Road and Dukes Hill, was bounded by a dance school to the east and existing residential development to the south.

The conversion of the public house would mainly entail internal alterations with the only major external change being the introduction of a pitched roof over an existing flat roof together with the addition of two small porches. The two semi-detached houses facing Dukes Hill would fill an existing gap in the street frontage and had been designed to reflect the type and style of the adjoining terraced houses along this road. No vehicular access would be provided along Dukes Hill.

The three storey apartment block would contain four garages on the ground floor and two two-bedroom flats on both the first and second floors. Each of the one-bedroom flats would have a small amenity and bin storage area with the two houses and the four two-bedroom flats having their own private rear garden areas.

Eleven parking spaces would be provided at the front of the site which, together with the four garages, would accommodate the parking requirements of the whole development, all of which would use one point of access onto Holyhead Road. A pedestrian path would link the two new houses with the parking area. Low brick walls would be provided along the back edge of the pavements to both Holyhead Road and Dukes Hill to give a sense of enclosure and privacy and, where possible, shrub planting would be included to soften the edges of the hard paving and parking areas at the front of the site.

One letter of objection had been received from a local resident on the grounds

of loss of light, increased noise and disturbance, more traffic, parking problems, increased drainage problems, and anti-social behaviour problems. Oakengates Town Council had objected on the grounds of overdevelopment of the site, inadequate parking provision, and encroachment onto the pavement at the Holyhead Road/Dukes Hill junction.

The Council's Highways Engineer had no objections to the proposed development subject to an agreement which secured a contribution of £5,000 from the applicant to implement a Traffic Regulation Order and associated double yellow lining across the site frontage, if it was deemed necessary in the interests of highway safety. He also recommended the imposing of a condition relating to the surfacing of the access, parking spaces and turning areas in a bound material. The provision of a total of fifteen parking spaces on the site was felt to be acceptable for twelve units, six of which would be one-bedroom flats, considering the type of accommodation to be provided and the relative proximity of Oakengates Centre.

The application site lay within a predominantly residential area and was shown as 'white land' on the Wrekin Local Plan. The public house had been closed for over six months due to it not being viable and the brewery had, subsequently, placed the empty building for sale on the open market. There were several other public houses within walking distance of the application site and Oakengates District Centre was only 600 metres away. Therefore, the loss of this community facility was not an issue. The application site had become untidy over the last few months and it was considered that the proposed development would substantially enhance its appearance and greatly improve the street scene.

It was considered that the proposed residential development of conversion and new build, with the provision of a mix of flats and houses, related positively to its context by respecting and responding to both the characteristics of the site and the prevailing townscape of the immediate area around it. The development would not have an adverse effect on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties by virtue of any undue overlooking, loss of light, or any overbearing effect.

Whilst Members agreed that the condition of the site needed addressing, concern was expressed regarding the proposed parking provision and the potential for increasing the existing problems with on-street parking on Dukes Hill and Wesley Drive. They asked if the yellow lines could be installed as soon as the development was completed rather than waiting for any parking problems to be identified as was the current intention. The Highways Engineer had proposed that yellow lines be installed across the site frontage but the Manager, Design & Development informed the Board that he could be requested to extend these to Dukes Hill and Wesley Drive, given their concerns for these areas.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application W2008/1033::

- a) **planning permission be granted subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement relating to a financial contribution of £5,000 towards the implementation of a Traffic Regulation Order and associated parking restrictions and to the conditions as set out in the report;**
- b) **the Council's Highway's Engineer be requested to consider implementing the Traffic Regulation Order at the earliest opportunity and extending it to include Dukes Hill and Wesley Drive.**
- (d) W2008/1038 – Land adjacent to Princess Royal Hospital, Apley Castle, Leegomery, Telford, Shropshire

This application sought planning permission for the erection of a temporary, demountable and modular single storey building as a GP surgery facility with three consulting rooms, treatment rooms, offices and ancillary facilities. The timber framed building, 38.5 metres long, 9.75 metres wide and 3 metres high, would be clad with 9mm plywood and painted to give a rendered finish. The site was a fairly flat grassed area to the north west of the hospital and would be screened from the surrounding area by a mature hedge along Whitchurch Drive and by mature trees to the south.

Following submission of the original application, it had subsequently been clarified that the facility would be an independent GP surgery with no association or connection to the Princess Royal Hospital, although access to the surgery would be through the hospital grounds with thirty new car parking spaces being provided next to the building. It was intended that the surgery would have a patient list of approximately 5,000-6,000 patients and would provide full primary care services. The applicant, the Telford & Wrekin Primary Care NHS Trust, had identified key areas, such as Hadley & Leegomery, which currently had an under provision of medical centres. It was envisaged that the temporary surgery would be required for a maximum of six years during which period the PCT would be reviewing the local North Telford area to identify an alternative and permanent site for the practice. It had been confirmed that, at the end of the six year period, the building would be demolished and the land reinstated to its present condition.

Although the application site was designated as Green Network, Policy OL4 of the Wrekin Local Plan stated that the Council might permit development subject to the proposal meeting the relevant criteria, as set out in the report. Hadley & Leegomery Parish Council had objected to the proposal on the grounds that it did not contain significant community benefits to justify location within the Green Network and the pressure which would be placed on the already stretched parking facilities at the hospital. The Council's Leisure Services had stated that, although there might be a community gain associated with the proposed development, there would be no environmental benefits. Therefore, it had suggested that, to compensate for this loss of open space, consideration should be given to requesting a financial contribution from the applicants to be used to enhance the adjacent Silkin Way and Apley

Castle Park. The fundamental integrity of the Green Network would be preserved as the existing grassed area around the application site would be retained.

Although the application site lay on the periphery of residential areas, it was considered that this was an acceptable location for a temporary surgery. The site lay relatively near to a regular bus route, adequate parking could be provided, and it would have only a limited impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It was, therefore, considered that the application did comply with Policy OL4 of the Wrekin Local Plan and Policy CS10 of the LDF Core Strategy by virtue of providing essential community services and benefits to the people of Apley/Leegomery.

Councillor Karen Blundell, the Ward Member, was invited to address the Board. She agreed with the provision of a GP surgery for the area but said that the proposed site would not serve the best interests of the public given its location on the periphery of Apley/Leegomery. An alternative site closer to the centre of Leegomery would be more accessible and would have the added benefit of protecting an area designated Green Network. She asked the Board to defer making a decision on the application so that the applicant could further investigate alternative sites.

Other Members of the Board supported her concerns and said that the applicant should be encouraged to seek an alternative site closer to the centre of Leegomery.

RESOLVED – that planning application W2008/1038 be deferred and the applicant requested to identify an alternative site.

(e) W2008/1147 – Sutherland School, Gibbons Road, Trench, Telford, Shropshire

This application by Telford & Wrekin Council requested planning permission to site a demountable building to provide accommodation for an exclusion unit on the car-park adjoining the school. The building would be single storey, timber framed and clad in cedar wood. The appearance would be acceptable, and the proposed site for the building would have little significant impact on the amenities of the adjoining residential area.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application W2008/1147 planning permission be granted for a temporary period of five years subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

PB-45 SITE VISIT

RESOLVED – that a Site Visit be made in respect of planning application W2007/1254 at 3.30 p.m. on the 10th December, 2008.

PB-46 PLANNING APPLICATIONS DEALT WITH UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

The Board received for information details of planning applications that had been determined under delegated powers.

The meeting ended at 6.45 p.m.

Chairman:

Date:

PLANS BOARD

Minutes of a meeting of the Plans Board held on Wednesday, 10th December, 2008 at 6.00 p.m. in the Civic Offices, Telford

PRESENT: Councillors I.T.W. Fletcher (Chairman), R. Aveley (as nominated substitute for A.A Meredith (Vice-Chairman), R.G. Chaplin, J.A. Francis, G.M. Green, F.R. Picken, H. Rhodes and M.J. Smith.

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor H. Williams for planning application W2007/1254 and Councillor K.L. Tomlinson for planning application W2008/1038.

PB-59 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Plans Board held on 19th November, 2008 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

PB-60 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillor A.A. Meredith (Vice-Chairman).

PB-61 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

PB-62 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

- (a) W2007/1254 – Plot E, Pool Hill/Doseley Road, Dawley, Telford, Shropshire

Members were reminded that this application was deferred by members at Plans Board on the 19th November 2008 to enable members to undertake a site inspection. This was an outline application for residential development on a plot of land to the east of Doseley Road and north of Pool Hill Road, Dawley. The site was located approximately one kilometre to south west of Dawley Centre and 1.5km from the Town Centre. It was irregular in shape and bounded to the north by Upper Pool Hill, to the west by Doseley Road and to the south and west by existing dwellings fronting Pool Hill.

The site covered an area of 1.21 ha and sloped steeply from the higher ground to the north and east towards the south. There was a drop of 14 metres from north to south and existing hedgerows and vegetation around the boundaries of the site that screened it. At present access into the site was from Pool Hill Road with the land being used for rough grazing. The Board were also advised that there were four mineshafts within the site and a further 2 shafts within 20m of the site.

Councillor H. Williams, one of the Ward Members for Dawley Magna, was invited to speak to the Board and outlined her concerns. She initially thanked

the Members for attending the earlier site visit and reiterated the comments that she had made at the previous Board meeting which centred on concerns for increased highway safety issues that would result from the development to both other road users and pedestrians, questioned the adequacy of the current drainage infrastructure if the development proceeded and the overall design of the development.

Members were also referred to the update sheet that had been prepared since the publication of the final report and that a revised design and access statement had been received from the applicant.

The Board were informed that the plans attached to the original report had demonstrated how the site could accommodate 35 dwellings with the one apartment block at the northern portion of the site only being of two storeys in height. As the proposed number of dwellings had been reduced the applicant's sought a reduction in the amount of the contribution for primary education and this had been agreed to be at the rate of £1250 per dwelling excluding any one bedroom dwellings.

Extra conditions were requested in connection with the future maintenance of the open area of land situated at the northern end of the site and other open space areas and the second extra condition to ensure that any remedial requirements were also undertaken in relation to the presence of radon gas on the application site.

Members were referred to the contents of the original report that had been presented to the Board meeting in September and following a discussion; it was,

RESOLVED – that in relation to planning application W2007/1254 that the Head of Planning & Environment be granted delegated authority to grant outline planning permission subject to the applicant/owner entering into Section 106 obligations to provide a financial contribution to off-site outdoor recreational provision, education facilities, improvements to a public right of way and 22.5% affordable dwellings and subject to the conditions as outlined within the report together with the inclusion of extra conditions to provide that no development should be commenced until a scheme for the future maintenance of the open spaces on the site had been submitted and also to ensure that the presence of radon gas is taken into account.

(b) W2008/0372 – Land at Greenacres Farm, Stanton Road, Ellerdine heath, Shropshire

The Board was referred to this application and that following a recent review of current case law in respect of the superseding of historic Section 106 agreements, it had been noted that the previous committee resolution in respect of the substitution of the original legal agreement for an agricultural workers dwelling was not in line with current best practice. Accordingly, Members were requested to reconsider the previous recommendation.

The crux of the matter was in the use of specific items in the earlier recommendation. The use of the term 'revocation' involved a distinct legal process through which the Council would formally seek to take action to quash the earlier agreement. This course of action however lies at odds with the preceding term that this action was voluntary.

To overcome this dichotomy, the conflict between pursuing a formal legal process as opposed to a direct agreement between the parties concerned, it was recommended that the earlier recommendation was simplified to confirm a single course of action.

For the clarification of any doubt, the voluntary agreement between the parties involved the applicant agreeing through a unilateral undertaking under Section 106 of the Planning Act not to implement the earlier planning consent if approval was granted for the provision of a similar dwelling in a different location.

The applicants had already submitted a draft agreement to the Local Planning Authority which had been considered by the Council's Solicitor. This agreement established that the applicant would not implement the approved application W2005/0591 for the agricultural workers dwelling. This agreement was felt by officers to offer sufficient protection to the Council to allow enforcement action to be taken through a court injunction if both dwellings were built. In due course, the earlier approval would lapse by virtue of the time limitation condition.

As it was intended that the proposed dwelling would be for use a temporary period within which it was hoped that the applicant would prove the commercial viability of the poultry operation over a period of three years, the agreement would also restrict occupancy of the dwelling to agricultural workers.

For clarity, the condition attached to the original consent in respect of installation of the mobile home and the timing of the stocking of the poultry unit with birds had been recommended.

Members were also referred to the additional information contained within the update sheet that had been prepared following the preparation of the report to amend the recommendation and delete reference to occupancy restrictions in the unilateral undertaking.

RESOLVED – that in relation to planning application W2008/0372 that subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Unilateral Undertaking not to implement the earlier planning permission W2005/0591 then delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning & Environment to grant planning permission subject to the conditions as outlined within the report.

(c) W2008/0626 – Land at Newport Business Park, Audley Road, Newport, Shropshire

The Board were reminded that consideration of this application had been deferred at the Board meeting that was held on 24th September 2008 to allow a financial viability assessment to be undertaken.

The planning update to members explained that the applicants did not agree to provide 35% affordable housing, as set out in the Core Strategy Policy CS6 for Newport, due to difficulties in the current economic downturn climate, but would provide 20%. Officers negotiated 25% affordable housing. Officers had sought advice from the Council's Asset & Property dept who considered the applicant's financial listings not unreasonable and the Council did not have evidence to the contrary. Therefore officers considered that this 25% provision was on balance acceptable.

It was noted that Members had previously expressed concerns that this would set a precedent to other developments in Newport and that the Council ought to be sure that the justification for providing less affordable housing than that stated in Policy CS6 was justified. Hence Members requested the application be deferred for a more detailed analysis of the applicant's financial information.

Officers had since sought the advice of a consultant and had received their findings, which were summarised within the report. It was reported that the applicant had been advised of the consultant's findings and that additional information was required of them. This had recently been submitted but a further deferment was requested to allow time for this additional information to be assessed and further considered by Officers before the application was submitted to Members for determination.

RESOLVED – that in relation to planning application W2008/0626 that consideration of the application be deferred in order to allow time to consider the details of recently submitted information.

(d) W2008/0844 – Wellington Road Surgery, Wellington Road, Newport, Shropshire

This application was deferred at the Plans Board meeting on 29th October 2008 in order for the Council to investigate any alternative and additional car parking facilities for the surgery.

It was reported that the Council's Highways Engineer had looked for Council owned land within 400 metres walking distance of the surgery, but did not find any sites that would be suitable.

The applicants had also submitted a Travel Plan which they hoped would encourage patients and staff to travel to the surgery by alternative and sustainable modes of transport. However, the Council's Highways Engineer had stated that in appropriate circumstances Travel Plans were regarded as a

positive step forward in dealing with highway issues, but it must be noted that by the very nature of how the surgery operated a Travel Plan was likely to have a very small mitigating effect on car usage.

The Council's Highways Engineer had stated that the additional information provided by the applicant failed to enhance the provision of parking within the site, and therefore did not overcome his concerns with regards to highway safety in the immediate vicinity of the application site. He therefore maintained his objections to the planning application.

The Council's Highways Engineer had offered response to various suggestions that had been put forward by the applicants to mitigate any future traffic and parking problems as outlined within the report.

Members, during the debate that followed, expressed a view that the extra health provision that would be situated at the surgery would benefit the local residents within Newport and would outweigh the perceived traffic and parking issues that had been outlined within the report and through the cited concerns of the Councils Highway Engineer. Accordingly Members expressed support of the application and accordingly; it was,

RESOLVED – that in relation to planning application W2008/0844 that delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning & Environment to grant planning permission subject to the imposition of appropriate planning conditions to be included within the planning approval.

(e) W2008/1038 – Land adjacent to, Princess Royal Hospital, Apley Castle, Leegomery, Telford, Shropshire

Members were reminded that this application had been deferred at the last meeting in order to request the applicant to investigate alternative sites closer to the centre of Leegomery.

The Board were informed that the Telford and Wrekin Primary Care NHS Trust had now stated that they would not be able to consider Leegomery Local Centre as a location for a temporary doctor's surgery, for two reasons:

- (a) A GP surgery is already situated at Leegomery Local Centre and another surgery there could compromise the existing medical practice
- (b) The PCT would be concerned at locating a temporary demountable structure there because they would not be able to guarantee the security of the building

The PCT had also confirmed that they were not able to find any other suitable sites in the Leegomery area that could accommodate a new GP surgery.

Councillor K.L.Tomlinson was invited to address the Board on behalf of Councillor K.T.Blundell who was currently absent. Councillor Tomlinson stated that whilst Councillor Blundell was not against the principle of the proposal per se she considered that the development should take place within the Leegomery Centre. This was on the basis of better access to the Centre being

achieved by the provision of an existing bus route and that there was also existing chemist provision.

Members were also referred to the updated information sheet that had been prepared following the publication of the report which advised of letters that had been received from the current doctor's surgery located within the Leegomery Centre in support of the location within Leegomery Centre being used and also further letters from the Parish Council in which they repeated the terms of their objections to the application, with further additional comments.

The Board were also referred to the additional letter and background paper from the applicant's agents. Members were again referred to the contents of the original report that had been submitted to the Board on 19th November 2008.

It had been established and concluded by Officers that the application site was an 'under doctored' area of Telford. The application site was considered to be an acceptable location for a temporary surgery whilst a more permanent site could be found in the Apley/Leegomey area. The site was situated relatively near to a regular bus route, adequate car parking could be provided, and it would have only a limited impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The application complied with the relevant policies in statutory local plans by virtue of providing essential community services and benefits to the people of Apley/Leegomery.

As a result there was no change to the officer recommendation as a result of the above information.

RESOLVED – that in relation to planning application W2008/1038 that temporary planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as outlined within the report.

(f) W2008/1202 – Tibberton Primary School, Maslan Crescent, Tibberton, Shropshire

This application was for the erection of a demountable building on part of the school playing field at Tibberton Primary School. The demountable would be of a standard timber finish, single storey classroom building, which would be relocated from Holmer Lake. The building was intended to provide pre-school and out of hours facilities. Tibberton Primary School was situated in the centre of the village off Maslan Crescent, with an adjoining large playing field surrounded by housing.

The Board was referred to the report in which the relevant planning policy, planning history, planning considerations and the consultation responses that had been received were outlined.

Members were advised that the demountable building would be located on the playing field area near to the main school building. Members were also

advised that the proposed location had been amended following consultations with the local Parish Council. The proposed location of the demountable would require the junior football pitch to be repositioned 10.5 metres, and although it would result in the loss of an area of the playing field, the use of the existing pitches would not be affected. On balance, it was considered that the demountable facility would not have a significant impact on the overall area of formal open space. The Council's Leisure Services Section also had no objections to the proposal. The demountable would be an adequate distance from surrounding housing such that its function would not significantly detract from local residential amenities.

RESOLVED – that in relation to planning application W2008/1202 that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as outlined within the report.

(g) W2008/1218 – 17 Highfield, Church Aston, Shropshire

The application was originally for consent to fell two Scots Pine trees and one Larch tree. However, following the Council's Woodland Officer's recommendations the proposed works had been amended to the felling of one pine tree and work to one other pine tree and one Larch. The trees were located at Highfield which was a residential cul-de-sac situated on the eastern edge of Church Aston. No.17 was a two-storey detached house and the rear garden featured several trees which were part of the wooded bank which adjoins The Folly footpath to the rear.

Members were referred to the relevant planning policies applicable to the application together with the consultation responses that had been received.

The Board was informed that the subject trees were the tallest trees in the rear garden of the property and were visible from outside the site. However the smaller Scots Pine tree which was proposed to be felled had been identified as being in poor condition by the Woodland Officer. The rear garden benefits from other smaller trees, which also contribute to amenity and provide screening.

On balance, the amended proposal to fell the one Scots Pine tree, and works to the other two trees was considered acceptable and would not result in a significant loss in the amenity provided by existing tree cover in this area. Although consent was granted for tree felling at the adjoining No.18 subject to a replanting condition, replanting was not considered necessary in this case, with only one tree now proposed to be felled. There were other trees in the rear garden to No.17 which would provide adequate amenity to retain the character of the area.

RESOLVED – that in relation to planning application W2008/1218 that tree preservation order consent be granted subject to the conditions as outlined within the report.

(h) W2008/1267 – Public Open Space, rear of Bromley Way, St Georges, Telford, Shropshire

This planning application related to the installation of a children's ball court and seating area on land to the north of Bromley Way in St Georges. The site, was located between Bromley Way and West Street, and to the west of Marrion's Hill, and was presently part of a larger flat area of grassland that was used for informal recreation. To the north of the site was a steeply sloping wooded embankment and to the west a group of mature trees. A small length of existing footpath would need to be diverted to accommodate the facility.

The proposed ball court would measure 12 x 20 metres, have a tarmac surface to it, and be surrounded by a 3 metre high mesh fence. A cycle rack, litter bin, and seating shelter would also be provided. The proposed play/recreational facilities were intended to be used predominantly by local children and young people aged between 3 and 16 for play, football, basketball, cricket, and socialising. The venue could also provide opportunities for occasional small localised events.

The ball court was intended to replace the one that had been closed down at the former Gower Street Youth Centre. Ward Councillors, the Parish Council, West Mercia Police, and the Beth Johnson Housing Association (owners of the properties in Bromley Way) had all been involved in finding an alternative location for the ball court. It was further understood that they all supported this facility and the site that had been chosen. Local children and young people had also helped in not only finding a site but also in identifying what facilities should be included within it.

The Board were also referred to the consultation responses, and relevant planning history, policies and planning considerations.

This replacement ball court was considered to be urgently required by the children and young people of St Georges. Many bodies and partners (as well as the young people themselves) had been involved in trying to find an alternative location for this facility, and although this site did not meet with the NPFA guidelines it was considered that it represented the only feasible and realistic location in St Georges. It was considered that the urgency and need to provide this ball court more than outweighed any problems of noise and disturbance that may be experienced by local residents when the facility had been installed.

RESOLVED – that in relation to planning application W2008/1267 that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as outlined within the report.

(i) W2008/1255 – Garrison Roundabout, Land off New Trench Road, Donnington, Telford, Shropshire

This application sought permission for advertising consent to display three non-illuminated advertisement signs on the Garrison Roundabout, on land off

the New Trench Road, Donnington, Telford. The Garrison Roundabout is more commonly known as the 'Three Guns roundabout' due to its distinctive display of artillery, and is situated on the A518 near Donnington in a built-up area of Telford.

The proposed signs were similar in size to those now displayed on several roundabouts in the Telford area, and were intended to promote local businesses, as part of the Telford & Wrekin Community Sponsorship scheme. In this case the proposed signs would advertise recruitment for the Territorial Army. The signs would be 1200mm across, and this size had been agreed with the Council's Highways Officer as an acceptable size with regard to highway safety and visibility. In this location, the proposed signs were considered acceptable as they would not result in excessive visual clutter, and would not detract from the amenities of the surrounding area generally.

However, Members were referred to the update sheet that was prepared following completion of the report which cited the objections of Lilleshall & Donnington Parish Council who had stated that the signs would spoil the look and character of the roundabout particularly when regard was given to the character and historic standing of the guns. A number of Members also expressed concerns about the application and the proposed location of the signs at this particular roundabout and concurred that the erection of the signs at this location would be detrimental to the character and amenity of the roundabout and the surrounding locality.

RESOLVED – that in relation to planning application W2008/1255 that planning permission be refused on the grounds that the proposed signs would be considered to be detrimental to the character and amenity of the roundabout and the surrounding locality.

PB-63 SITE VISITS

No Site Visits were arranged.

PB-64 PLANNING APPLICATIONS DEALT WITH UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

The Board received for information details of planning applications that had been determined under delegated powers.

The meeting ended at 7.05 p.m.

Chairman:

Date:

LICENSING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Licensing Committee held on Tuesday, 2nd December 2008 at 4.30 pm in the Reception Suite, Civic Offices, Telford

PRESENT: E.J. Greenaway (Vice-Chairman) – sitting as Chairman for the meeting, R.G. Chaplin, G.J.L. Davies, J.A. Francis, Y.C. Hicks, T.J. Hope, T. Kiernan, A.A. Mackenzie, C.N. Mason, H. Rhodes, C.F. Smith and A.G.P. Williams.

LC-18 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meetings of the Licensing Committee held on 21st October and 25th November 2008 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

LC-19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors V.A. Fletcher (Chairman), G.P. Hossell and K.L. Tomlinson.

LC-20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

LC-23 APPROVAL FOR CONDITIONS FOR DOG BREEDING LICENCES

The report of the Regulation & Resilience Manager was received which sought Members' approval of revised conditions of licence for dog breeding establishment licences.

Members were advised that The Breeding of Dogs Act 1973 required the proprietors of dog breeding establishments, breeding dogs for sale, to hold a licence issued by the Local Authority. This Act, as amended and extended by the Breeding and Sale of Dogs (Welfare) Act 1999, also provided for the inspection of premises at which the dogs were bred, control the transportation of puppies and set standards in relation to these matters.

The Committee were further advised that the licence granted by the Local Authority, would stipulate a number of conditions, considered necessary or expedient in a particular case. The aim of these conditions was to ensure that high standards of animal health and welfare were maintained in breeding establishments.

The conditions now considered by the Committee were adopted from the model conditions for dog breeding establishments, issued jointly by the Chartered Institute of Environmental Health, the British Veterinary Association, the British Small Animal Association and the Local Government Association. It was proposed that these conditions would be attached to all domestic and non-domestic dog breeding licences issued by this Local Authority.

The Committee was informed that there were generally two ways in which dog breeding establishments operated. Some people maintained the stock within their private dwelling house and these were simply known as *domestic breeders*. *Non-domestic breeders* would keep dogs in outside accommodation consisting of buildings either attached or detached from the private dwelling. However, there were occasions when the conditions for the non-domestic breeder should also be applied to the domestic breeder.

In deciding whether or not to grant a licence, the Local Authority must have regard to a number of considerations and had discretion to refuse a licence. However, in the cases where a licence was refused or to the inclusion of any individual or group of conditions an applicant had a right of appeal to the Magistrates' Court.

Dog breeding premises and prescribed mandatory records would be inspected in accordance with the legislation. The licensed breeder would also be able to sell a dog to its final home or a third party, subject to other conditions. The court also has powers to order imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months and/or a fine not exceeding level 4 on the standard scale upon conviction for keeping a dog breeding establishment without a licence or any offence under the Act, including a breach of conditions.

Members were referred to the of those public and specialist bodies consulted during the compilation of the report as detailed within Appendix C of the report.

RESOLVED – that the standard conditions of licence for non-domestic dog breeders as outlined within Appendix A and the standard conditions of licence for domestic dog breeders as outlined within Appendix B of the report be approved.

LC-24 APPROVAL FOR NAPIT ELECTRICAL CERTIFICATION FOR LICENSED PREMISES

The Committee considered the report of the Regulation & Resilience Manager which sought approval for members of the National Association for Professional Inspectors and Testers (NAPIT) being approved as being able to provide electrical installation certification on premises that are licensed by the Council.

Members were informed that at present the Council's current conditions for Animal Licences required electrical contractors to be either NICEIC or ECA registered. The Council had received a written request from the Chief Executive of NAPIT for NAPIT Members to be accepted by the Council's Licence conditions.

The Committee were informed that the Council's current conditions of licence for Animal Boarding Licences, Pet Shop Licences and Dangerous Wild Animal Licences state that electrical inspections must be carried out by either a NICEIC or ECA registered electrical contractors. Members were referred to the current conditions that were attached at Appendix A to the report.

In 2007 and 2008, the Council's Freedom of Information Officer received requests for information from the Chief Executive of NAPIT, requesting that the Council should accept NAPIT members as suitable Electrical Contractors to inspect premises which were licensed by Telford & Wrekin Council. The Committee were further referred to the relevant exchange of correspondence between NAPIT and the Council together with the relevant NAPIT Local Authority Fact Sheet which was attached at Appendix C to the report. Members were also informed that for the purposes of Public Liability Insurance, the NICEIC, ECA and NAPIT were all recognised certification bodies for commercial premises.

Following a discussion, the Committee;

RESOLVED – that

(a) the acceptance of the National Association of Professional Inspectors and Testers (NAPIT) Certification for premises licensed by Telford & Wrekin Council be approved.

(b) the General Animal Boarding condition of licence be amended to read:

“In the case of commercial premises, but not in the case of private dwellings used for the purposes of home boarding, all electrical installations, heating and lighting etc., must be examined annually and certified that they comply with B.S.7671. If Emergency Lighting is fitted it must comply with B.S. 5266. Please note that any Electrical contractor carrying out work in support of the application must be registered with the NICEIC, NAPIT or ECA. If in doubt regarding approved contractors please contact this office.”

(c) Condition Number 15 of the Council's Pet Shop Licence Conditions be amended to read:

“Pet Shops All electrical installation, heating and lighting etc., must be examined annually and certified that they comply with B.S. 7671. If Emergency Lighting is fitted it must comply with B.S. 5266. Please note that any Electrical contractor carrying out work in support of the application must be registered with the NICEIC, NAPIT or ECA. If in doubt regarding approved contractors please contact this office.”

(d) Condition Number 7 of the Council's Dangerous Wild Animal Conditions be amended to read:

“In the case of commercial premises, but not in the case of private dwellings used for the purposes of keeping Dangerous Wild Animals, all electrical installations, heating and lighting etc, must be examined annually and certified that they comply with B.S.7671. If Emergency lighting is fitted it must comply with B.S. 5266. Please note that any Electrical contractor carrying out work

in support of the application must be registered with the NICEIC, NAPIT or ECA. If in doubt regarding approved contractors please contact this office.”

LC-25 DUAL DRIVER CONDITIONS OF LICENCE

The purpose of this report was to inform the Licensing Committee in respect of a review of Telford & Wrekin Council’s Dual Driver Conditions of Licence. The Committee was reminded that a comprehensive review of Telford & Wrekin Council’s conditions of licence for Private Hire and Hackney Carriages had been undertaken, arising from the Taxi Action Plan. The Council now intended to amend its Dual Licence Conditions in line with the recent amendments to Private Hire and Hackney Carriage Conditions of Licence.

Members were advised that in addition to Private Hire and Hackney Carriage Driver Badges, the Council also issued Dual Driver Badges. A Driver who is issued with a Dual Driver Badge may drive either a Hackney Carriage or a Private Hire Vehicle licensed in the Borough. The Committee was further informed that the Council’s Dual Driver Licence conditions did not form part of the Council’s recent comprehensive review of licence conditions.

It was proposed that the Licensing Service would conduct a six week Consultation Process after which the matter would be brought before Members of the Licensing Committee to consider the results of the consultation and approve the revised Conditions of Licence.

RESOLVED – that the contents of the report be noted.

The meeting ended at 5.30 pm

Chairman:

Date:

LICENSING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Licensing Committee held on Tuesday, 16th December 2008 at 9.30 am in the Reception Suite, Civic Offices, Telford

PRESENT: V.A.Fletcher (Chairman), E.J.Greenaway (Vice-Chairman), R.G.Chaplin, G.J.L.Davies, J.A.Francis, T.Kiernan, A.A.Mackenzie, C.N.Mason and C.F.Smith.

LC-34 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meetings of the Licensing Committee held on 2nd December 2008 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman subject to the addition of the word “list” in the first line of paragraph 8 of minute number LC-23.

Members were informed that following the approval of the minutes of the meeting of the Licensing Committee held on 21st October 2008 and following further perusal of the relevant documentation it was apparent that two particular conditions had been incorrectly recorded and did not concur with the decision of the Committee. The particular conditions were within the Hackney Carriage Conditions – explanatory note to condition 9.1 and condition number 4.7 of the Private Hire Vehicle Conditions. Following confirmation to the Committee of the recorded decision of the Committee it was agreed that the conditions could be accordingly amended to accord with the Member’s decision.

LC-35 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors Y.C.Hicks, T.J.Hope, G.P.Hossell, H.Rhodes, K.L.Tomlinson and A.G.P.Williams.

LC-36 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor G.J.L.Davies declared a personal although non-prejudicial interest in minute number LC-38 and indicated that he would retire from the meeting during the consideration and determination of this particular hearing.

LC-37 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED – that the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they may involve the likely disclosure of information as defined in Paragraph 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A Local Government Act 1972.

N.B. In accordance with his previously stated declaration of interest Councillor G.J.L.Davies left the meeting prior to the commencement of the next agenda item.

LC-38 PRIVATE HEARING – MR.S.S

Members were informed that the applicant was not in attendance, following confirmation of the correspondence that had been submitted to the Applicant, the receipt of legal advice from the Council's solicitor and after consideration and discussion by the Committee, it was;

RESOLVED – that consideration and determination of this application be adjourned sine die.

N.B. Councillor G.J.L.Davies returned to the meeting at the conclusion of this particular agenda item.

LC-39 PRIVATE HEARING – MR.K.P

After hearing the evidence presented by the Council's Licensing Operations Manager, the complainant and the licence holder in accordance with the hearings procedure and following consideration and discussion by the Committee, it was;

RESOLVED – the Committee was satisfied that the Private Hire Driver did not pose a significant risk to public safety and could continue to be licensed as a Private Hire Vehicle Driver by this Council. However a severe written warning as to the need for appropriate behaviour when acting as a Private Hire Vehicle Driver should be issued to the licensee with such warning remaining on his file.

LC-40 PRIVATE HEARING – MR.P.O

After hearing the evidence presented by the Council's Licensing Operations Manager and the applicant in accordance with the hearings procedure and following consideration and discussion by the Committee, it was;

RESOLVED – that in accordance with Section 51 (1) of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976, the Committee was satisfied that the applicant was a fit and proper person to be licensed as a Private Hire Vehicle Driver by this Council.

The meeting ended at 3.15 pm

Chairman:

Date:

STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of the Standards Committee held on Thursday, 18 December, 2008 at 6.00 p.m. in the Civic Offices, Telford

PRESENT: A. Simpson (Independent Member - Chairman), Councillors A.J. Stanton (Vice-Chairman), R. Aveley, C.R.P. Mollett, U.E. Sambrook, K.S. Sahota and A.G.P. Williams
B. Bayley, F. Beasland and A. Selvaratnam (Independent Members). D. Edwards, R. Wickson and R. Williams (Parish Council representatives)

ST-17 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Standards Committee held on 9 October 2008 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

ST-18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors V.A. Fletcher and H. Rhodes. P.A. Picken (Parish Council representative)

ST-19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Parish Council representatives D. Edwards, R. Wickson and R. Williams declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Agenda item 8 (Appendix F), recommendation 2.2

The Chairman agreed to hear this item at the beginning of the meeting. The Parish Council representatives all left the room for the duration of this item.

ST-20 STANDARDS BOARD FOR ENGLAND GUIDANCE ON THE ROLE AND MAKE-UP OF STANDARDS COMMITTEES

The report of the Interim Head of Legal Services informed Members of guidance issued by the Standards Board for England. In particular, the guidance concerned Independent members and Parish representatives serving on Standards Committees.

There was nothing in the guidance about the terms of office of Parish and Town Council representatives; however the Committee may take the view that it would be appropriate to have a consistent approach to Parish and Town Council representatives as is taken with Independent members of the Committee. The Committee were invited to establish the current terms of office of the serving Parish and Town Council representatives which would be as follows:-

- Councillor Roy Williams, term of office until 7th July 2011 representing eight years as a Parish Representative of the Committee
- Councillor Roy Wickson, term of office until 22nd January 2012 representing eight years as a Parish Representative of the Committee
- Councillor Pauline Picken, serving a term of office until 17th June 2012 (as agreed at the previous meeting of the Standards Committee) and representing the end of a first term of office and then subject to re-appointment
- Councillor David Edwards serving a term until 11th June 2012 (again as approved at a previous meeting of the Standards Committee) representing the end of a first term of office and then subject to re-appointment

RESOLVED –

a) that the contents of the report be noted.

b) that the Committee agree the Parish Council Representatives terms of office as shown below:

- **Councillor Roy Williams, term of office until 7th July 2011, representing eight years as a Parish Representative of the Committee**
- **Councillor Roy Wickson, term of office until 22nd January 2012, representing eight years as a Parish Representative of the Committee**
- **Councillor Pauline Picken, serving a term of office until 17th June 2012 (as agreed at the previous meeting of the Standards Committee) and representing the end of a first term of office and then subject to re-appointment**
- **Councillor David Edwards serving a term until 11th June 2012 (again as approved at a previous meeting of the Standards Committee) representing the end of a first term of office and then subject to re-appointment**

ST-21 CONSULTATION ON THE CODE OF CONDUCT FOR LOCAL AUTHORITY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES

The report of the Interim Head of Legal Services informed the Committee that the Department for Communities and Local Government had issued a consultation paper suggesting proposed changes to the members' Code of Conduct as well as the introduction of a model employees' code of conduct which would be incorporated into local government employees' terms and conditions of employment. The Committee was asked to consider the

consultation document which was attached to the report at Appendix 2 and the proposed draft response which was attached to the report at Appendix 3.

The Head of Human Resources, welcoming the consultation document, informed Members that the Council had already successfully produced an Employee of Conduct. He felt that the proposals for two codes for employees and qualifying employees was unnecessary as one code could adequately cover all employees. In response to questions, he confirmed that the model code would ultimately be enshrined in the contracts of employees and that the code would also cover Parish Councils.

RESOLVED – That the consultation response, at Appendix 3 of the report, subject to the amendments agreed to by the Committee, be submitted to the Department for Communities and Local Government in response to their consultation document.

ST-22 STANDARDS COMMITTEE HANDBOOK

The report of the Interim Head of Legal Services informed the Committee of the progress made in preparing a Standards Committee Members Handbook and sought the Committee's views on documents to be included. A draft index for the Handbook was attached to the report.

RESOLVED – that the Committee approve the Index for the Standards Committee Members Handbook.

ST-23 MEMBERS CODE OF CONDUCT TRAINING

The report of the Interim Head of Legal Services informed the Committee about the recent Member Code of Conduct Training sessions, held on 12 November 2008. Feedback from those attending the session confirm that there were problems with the training and it was not as successful as in previous years. Guidance was sought from the Committee as to how the training could be improved.

A number of Members felt that the main problem with the recent training session was the quality of presentation. A number of Members commented that they strongly preferred the previous training presenter as he had interacted well with those attending the session. The Group Solicitor reported that quotations had been received from training providers and that cost was a significant issue. One suggestion was that Parish Councils be charged a training fee. It was also suggested that the training could be provided using the expertise available within the Council. The Group Solicitor agreed to investigate the options available and report back to the Committee.

RESOLVED – that the Group Solicitor investigates the training options available and brings a report back to the Committee.

ST-24 ANNUAL REVIEW OF STANDARDS COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE

The report of the Interim Head of Legal Services provided details of the Terms of Reference and the role and function of the Standards Committee, as contained in the Council's Constitution, for review by the Committee. The Standards Committee reviews its Terms of Reference annually. There had been a number of changes to the Terms of Reference within the last few months and the Committee were asked to consider these changes and make any recommendations for further changes as appropriate.

Members considered and reviewed the changes made and had no further recommendations at the current time.

RESOLVED – that the Terms of Reference of the Standards Committee be agreed

ST-25 CODE OF CONDUCT COMPLAINTS MADE TO THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE - QUARTERLY UPDATE: 1ST JULY TO 30TH SEPTEMBER 2008.

The report of the Interim Head of Legal Services provided the Committee with details of the Code of Conduct complaints received by the Standards Committee during the period 1 July 2008 to 30 September 2008.

From 1 July to 30 September 2008 the Standards Committee received one Code of Conduct complaint under the new system for local assessment. A quarterly return had been forwarded to the Standards Board for England.

RESOLVED – that the contents of the report be noted

The meeting ended at 6.55 pm

Chairman:

Date:

SCRUTINY LEADERSHIP BOARD

Minutes of a meeting of the Scrutiny Leadership Board held on Monday, 5th January 2009 at Civic Offices, Telford

PRESENT: Councillors R. Aveley, J.A. Francis, A.A. Mackenzie, A.A. Meredith and D.R.W. White.

ALSO PRESENT: Ken Clarke (Head of Audit & Democracy), Alison Smith (Scrutiny Manager), Sarah Morris (Scrutiny Officer), and Chris Corbett (Democratic Services Officer).

SLB-1 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

RESOLVED – that Councillor D.R.W.White be elected Chairman of the Scrutiny Leadership Board until the next Municipal Elections in May 2011.

SLB-2 APOLOGY FOR ABSENCE

Councillor H. Williams – plus Councillor L. Lomax (Chairman of the Value for Money Scrutiny Group) and Councillor G. Green (co-opted Member)

SLB-3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST/PARTY WHIP

None.

SLB - 4 ROLE OF THE SCRUTINY LEADERSHIP BOARD AND THE LEAD SCRUTINY MEMBERS

The Head of Audit & Democracy presented a report that outlined the envisaged main tasks that would be undertaken by the Board.

Those tasks were:-

- To have overall responsibility for ensuring that the Council's scrutiny function is effective and to develop action plans for ongoing improvement
- To co-ordinate, plan and approve a programme of work for the Scrutiny Assembly
- To undertake scrutiny reviews of strategic or cross-cutting items, including the Local Area Agreement, and to hold the Cabinet and appropriate representatives of partner organisations to account for these items
- To hear call-ins and Community Calls for Action. Additional SLB meetings will usually be called for these items to ensure that they are dealt with in a timely manner
- To have ongoing dialogue with members of the Cabinet to ensure that scrutiny is linked to the work of the Council as a whole

- To consider referrals from Cabinet and decide whether to include them in the scrutiny work programme.

The report also highlighted the proposed role for Lead Scrutiny Members, as follows :-

- Attending Scrutiny Leadership Board meetings, undertaking the associated work and contributing to discussions and decision making
- Leading and participating in Scrutiny Assembly meetings
- Taking a lead on the Community Priority assigned to them by:
 - Attending regular meetings with the Cabinet Member(s) within their area of responsibility to stay up to date with current issues, including discussion of upcoming decisions and the Forward Plan
 - Chairing reviews and standing sub-groups
 - Liaising with the scrutiny team to stay up to date on the progress of work
 - Presenting scrutiny reports at Cabinet and other meetings as appropriate.
- Being a media spokesperson for scrutiny work
- Attending seminars and conferences as necessary.

Members accepted their role and commented that scrutiny needed to be constructively challenging.

SLB - 5 LEAD RESPONSIBILITIES FOR EACH COMMUNITY PRIORITY.

The Head of Audit & Democracy presented a report that outlined the 7 Community Priorities of the Council. Board Members views and preferences had been sought prior to the meeting and, following a short debate, it was

RESOLVED that

- **All Members of the Scrutiny Leadership Board take collective responsibility for Corporate Priority 1: transforming Telford & Wrekin.**
- **Councillor Joy Francis take lead responsibility for Priority 2: Giving Children & Young People the Best Possible Start in their lives.**
- **Councillor Roger Aveley take lead responsibility for Priority 3: Maintaining a High Quality, Attractive and Sustainable Environment.**
- **Councillor Helen Williams take lead responsibility for Priority 4: Creating a Safe, Strong and Cohesive Community.**
- **Councillor Derek White take lead responsibility for Priority 5: Promoting Healthy Communities and Improving the Quality of Life of Vulnerable and Older People.**

- Councillor Alan Mackenzie take lead responsibility for Priority 6: Strengthening the Local Economy & the Skills of Local People.
- Councillor Adrian Meredith take lead responsibility for Priority 7: An Efficient, Effective and Customer-Focused Council that delivers Value-For-Money for the Community.

SLB - 6 AGREEMENT ON COMPLETION OF SCRUTINY WORK IN PROGRESS AND FOR CHAIRING THE SCRUTINY STANDING SUB-GROUPS

A document was tabled that outlined the current scrutiny work in progress and sought suggested lead Members to carry the work forward to completion.

Furthermore, after a short debate, Members made nominations to the position of Chairmen of the Scrutiny Sub-Groups (to be formally considered at their appropriate next meetings, as follows.

RESOLVED – as follows:-

Work in Progress

- | | |
|--------------------------|---|
| • School Travel | - Lead Member, Cllr Joy Francis |
| • Bus Services | - Lead Member, Cllr Roger Aveley |
| • Housing/Homelessness | - Lead Member, Cllr Derek White |
| • Footpath Gating | - Lead Member, Cllr Karen Tomlinson |
| • Section 106 Agreements | - Lead Member, Cllr Karen Tomlinson |
| • Procurement | - Lead Member, Cllr Roger Aveley
(Cllr Adrian Meredith agreed to assist) |

Scrutiny Sub Groups

- | | |
|-----------------------|---|
| • Value for Money | - nominated Chairman – Cllr Louise Lomax to continue as Chairman until May 2009. After this date, the group would elect a chairman from their membership. It was also agreed that the Chairman of the VfMSG should be a co-opted member of the Scrutiny Leadership Board (also Cllr Andrew Eade to be approached to ask him to appoint Cllr A Meredith to one of the two Conservative group’s places on the Value for Money Group.) |
| • Corporate Parenting | - nominated Chairman – Cllr Gill Green (also to invite one of the co-opted scrutiny members with a background in children & young people to join the group, and to review the Terms of Reference to reflect this) |
| • Campus Telford | - nominated Chairman – Cllr Joy Francis |
| • Health | - nominated Chairman – Cllr Derek White |

**SLB - 7 ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME
SELECTION WORKSHOP ON 6TH JANUARY 2009**

Members received a short outline of the format and procedures for the Scrutiny Work Programme Selection Workshop to be held on 6th January 2009.

SLB – 8 CHAIRMAN’S UPDATE

The Chairman reported that there were impending staffing changes in the Council’s Scrutiny section to cover maternity leave for the Scrutiny Officer and Assistant Democratic Services Officer posts. Cover for the Scrutiny Officer post would commence on 19th January and recruitment was underway for cover for the Assistant Democratic Services Officer. Members were requested to have those staff moves in mind when calling upon the resources of the Scrutiny Section in the short term.

SLB - 9 DATES OF MEETINGS 2008/09

Members noted the next meeting of the Board on 20th January 2009 and agreed that the meeting would commence at 4.00 p.m. as would future meetings of the Board.

The meeting ended at 6. 14 p.m.

Chairman:

Date: