



**Minutes of the REMOTE Full Council meeting held via GoToMeetings at Leonard Smith House, West Centre Way
On Thursday 21st January 2021**

Due to the current Covid-19 epidemic and the changes in legislation dated 7th April 2020, the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020, allows for all local authority meetings to be held remotely, either by video or telephone conferencing, live streaming, or web chat.

PRESENT:

Cllr Shaun Davies, Cllr Amrik Jhawar, Cllr Raj Mehta, Cllr. Rob Parker, Cllr Lee Vidor, Cllr John Yorke

CLERK:

Sharon George, Clerk

IN ATTENDANCE

Simon Bailey (Project, Events, & Engagement Officer)

Jill Holland (Deputy Clerk) (*Arrived 19:20 – attending PROW Meeting*)

Matt Lever (Admin Assistant)

Judy Parker (Facilities & Community Liaison Officer)

Cllr Paul Watling (Cabinet Member for Co-Operative Communities, Engagement and Partnerships, Telford & Wrekin Council)

2020/105 CHAIR'S WELCOME

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2020/106 APOLOGIES

Apologies received from:

Cllr Jayne Greenaway (Illness)

Cllr Mike Tyler (Personal commitments)

Cllr Jacqui Seymour (Borough Meeting)

APOLOGIES RECEIVED AND ACCEPTED

It was noted that apologies should be given in advance to the Clerk where possible and that any apologies are formally agreed by a vote taken at the meeting.

2020/107 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor	Interest	Declaration	Minute no.
John Yorke	Community Facility	LVCA Member	2020/117

2020/108 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

No public present.

2020/109 NEW COMMUNITIES FUND

Cllr Paul Watling thanked Cllr Raj Mehta and all councillors for inviting him to the meeting and explained that he had been asked to speak to the Parish Council about the New Communities Fund. The fund stands at £500,000, he said, which remained largely unspent. He had worked alongside local councillors to identify areas where the money could potentially be spent and had been able to fund most of those areas through the existing budgets of Telford & Wrekin Council (TWC). He said that this was positive news, as the £500,000 is still available as a fund for new communities.

He explained that they are “now in listening mode”, that he was attending the Full Council Meeting “in listening mode”, and he wanted to hear what the Parish Council’s thoughts were. He added that they had been engaging with Bournville Village Trust (BVT), local residents’ groups, and others to gain their thoughts on the issue. He said that what he wanted to

do was to bring together a partnership board made up of key stakeholders - including the Parish Council - to help influence how they move on with the investment, and to look to support new communities developing in the area. He welcomes councillors' thoughts on the project, and how to move forward.

Cllr Lee Vidor asked Cllr Watling if the £500,000 fund was just for Lawley, or for Lawley and Lightmoor, and if it was something that was being distributed between the two areas.

Cllr Watling clarified that the fund was for Lawley and Lightmoor, and that it was to cover new communities in those areas. He said that he had done some work with borough councillors, and they had started to look at some issues they had identified which could be met. They were working alongside all partners to work out how to use the money.

Cllr Vidor asked if the project fund had been spent, or if it was still being looked at. Cllr Watling explained that the money was still there; they were looking to set up a partnership board to identify how the money would be used.

Cllr John Yorke said that he wanted to "cut to the chase"; when the fund was initially mooted in 2019, he said, the expectation for residents in Lawley had been around the fact that they were missing a community centre. He said that he expected Cllr Watling and his team were aware that the Parish Council was pursuing that, and that it boiled down to money. "£500,000 sounds like a lot, we are looking for a big chunk", he said. He added that they were looking at "something like six figures out of that £500,000", clarifying that this was on basis that the community centre would serve the whole of Lawley and Overdale. He added that he felt that sometimes "the focus is only on BVT fee payers". He said that the Parish Council should be "holding [Cllr Watling's] hand behind his back and getting a share and a commitment".

Cllr Watling thanked Cllr Yorke for his comments. He explained that TWC does not make those decisions - the board makes them. It is a partnership, he said, adding that they money was there, and that the Parish Council as a partner should make the decision on how that worked. He said that he knew that TWC had made the commitment of the land for the community centre, which he felt was a big commitment in terms of monetary value. It would be down to the partnerships to be sure on what they wanted the money to be used for, he added, pointing out that it was a "finite amount of money".

Cllr Rob Parker asked if it was possible for the Parish Council to apply to this fund for the money for the community centre. He said that he was interested in how the partnership group was going to be constituted. He had seen the press releases from 2019 and said that there was no mention of the Parish Council in those, although BVT and other partners were mentioned. He added that he was interested to find out how the partnership group was going to be constituted.

Cllr Watling said that he believed the Parish Council should be part of that partnership. The constitution of it would be down to the partnership, he said, adding that it had to be "legal and correct". TWC was not making the decision on how it would be run, he said, and that as a partnership it needs to be run effectively. He said that the Parish Council has a voice, with democratically elected members locally, and he wanted it to be involved in the partnership.

Cllr Parker said that he was "pleased to hear that", and asked how the Parish Council could be involved, as it had not been involved in any meetings so far.

Cllr Watling said that Angie Astley, who is leading the partnership, would be speaking to the Clerk, Sharon George, and the Chairman, Cllr Raj Mehta, to give details on how the Parish Council can move forward to the next stage.

Cllr Parker asked if there was a time limit on the money.

Cllr Watling said that there was no time limit on the money "as far as he is aware". The money had been given as a fund for new communities in the area, he said. That was something the partnership might want to look at, he added, as they might want to see it spent over a period of time. Cllr Watling felt that it was about what was best for the communities in the area, and that it was best for the people making that decision to be the people who live there.

Cllr Raj Mehta thanked Cllr Watling for attending the meeting and explaining the New Communities Fund. He said that "he is a true believer", like all of his colleagues in attendance, and that "building bridges is something [he] believes in", adding that a partnership was a good thing to do. He said that he looked forward to receiving that email from Angie Astley, and that the Parish Council would reply to it

Cllr Watling explained that the reason TWC had been so successful during the pandemic was because of the partnerships it had with parish councils and the "extremely positive" voluntary sector. If it weren't for that partnership, he said, they wouldn't have been able to do what they had done over the past year. He added that he could see that partnership becoming key to "embedding of community spirit" across all the areas it covers.

Cllr Mehta asked the Clerk if she had any questions. The Clerk asked if the money were to be divided between Lawley and Lightmoor, and is so, how – would it be dependent upon the electorate?

Cllr Watling said that was to be decided. The Clerk clarified that the Parish Council had a great interest in Lawley, but that Lightmoor was outside its boundaries, and that it would be useful to know what sum of money would be available. She also asked if it would have involvement from the Dawley Hamlets and The Gorge Parish Councils.

Cllr Watling said that it was not a “top-down approach”. He said that money was available for those areas, and they wanted it to work together as a partnership. He said that he was not going to say that there was “so much money for one area, and so much for another”, because needs may be different across the different areas.

Cllr Mehta thanked Cllr Watling and said that they would be looking forward to Angie Astley’s email.

Cllr Paul Watling departed the meeting at 18:15.

2020/110 MINUTES

The minutes from the **Full Council Meeting** held on **10th December 2020** were **APPROVED**. It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes be signed and **ADOPTED** as a true record. This was **PROPOSED** by Cllr John Yorke and **SECONDED** by Cllr Amrik Jhawar.

2020/111 COMMUNITY ACTION TEAM

The Clerk explained that she’d had a discussion with Dean Sergeant (TWC) after a meeting regarding the Community Action Team (CAT), and he had put a proposal together which she had shared with the councillors. She said that a decision needed to be made on whether the Parish Council would buy into the scheme, and if so, to what extent. A decision needed to be made as it was an item on the budget, she said.

Cllr Vidor’s biggest concern was that he wished to see details on enforcement, and what the Parish Council could and could not afford. He asked the Clerk if any details had been sent to her. He added that the biggest issue in Lawley was around new estates and adoptions. It would be great to have an enforcement officer, he said, but not if they could not enforce anything.

The Clerk said that she had not received any more details from Dean Sergeant and had not chased him.

Cllr Shaun Davies said that the CAT is made up of three elements – the Parish Environmental Team (PET), which he felt was “clearly a better deal with the new offer”. He said that in regard to the enforcement officer, the Parish Council would get an officer with powers that do not just cover parking issues, but also anti-social behaviour, littering, and environmental crime. He added that they do a lot of close work with the local police team, and so they have a large amount of leverage with them. He highlighted three operations dealing mopeds and bikes that took place recently, which were led by the enforcement team. The Parish Council would also get support around school gate parking.

Cllr Davies continued by pointing out that it would not just benefit Lawley; the parish includes Dawley Bank, The Rock, and Overdale, he said, where enforcement issues are as commonplace as in other areas. He said that the other benefit would be that even on non-adopted roads, there is an offence of blocking highways, and that the enforcement team and police could work together on that.

Cllr Davies said that the third element was the public realms officer. He explained that they chase-up street champions, snow wardens, and provide other community support. Cllr Davies’ perspective was that the Parish Council needed to think about how it would look if it did not buy into the scheme while other areas did, and how the Parish Council would look when those other areas started to see drops. He said that other areas would see a much better offer around enforcement and public realm issues. This would be a “first step in a really positive conversation with BVT around estate management charges and efficiencies we can take on board”, he added.

Cllr Davies’ view was that the Parish Council “should really have the full CAT offer”. He added that he thought Dean Sergeant had said that there would be a mechanism to ensure the existing PET would be kept in place.

The Clerk said that when she had contacted Dean Sergeant, she had adopted an “it isn’t broken, so we don’t want to fix it” attitude. She said that the Parish Council would be “foolish” not to look at the CAT package, as it would get far more for its money, but that they would want to keep the existing PET operative – a point with which Dean Sergeant agreed. The Clerk explained that while the community liaison officer would work very closely with Kay Grice (Environmental Locality Officer, TWC), there were monthly walkabouts with the Parish Council’s existing PET operative, who acted almost like a liaison

officer and reported a lot of issues, as well as working closely with public realms. The Clerk added that she was not convinced that a full-time liaison officer would be necessary.

Cllr Yorke explained that his view was always about what the electorate would think; he said that he believed they would think that they were already paying for this in their existing council tax. He said that he was very interested in an email the Clerk had sent to councillors on 11 January, which explained that Dean Sergeant had offered an alternative package – the PET with an apprentice, an enforcement officer for two days a week, and two CCTV cameras. Cllr Yorke said that this would cost the Parish Council just under £40,000, which he felt was a “pretty good deal”, and something that would be accepted more by residents compared to the full £80,000, which would put up the precept cost by 23p a week. If the price were brought down to £40,000, he said, the precept cost would only be 7p a week. He said that he would take on the £39,930 offer with match funding for the next three years.

Cllr Parker pointed out that he had asked at the December meeting if there was some data on what enforcement officers had already succeeded in doing across the Borough Council since it’d had that power and asked again if that data was available. He said it would be useful to know the scale of impact the enforcement officers might have.

The Clerk said that no, that data was not available.

Cllr Parker said that one thing he was concerned about was any alterations to the way the existing PET team worked, if there were any. He said that it had worked very well for the parish over the years and continues to do so, and he would be concerned about doing anything that could impact that detrimentally.

The Clerk agreed with Cllr Parker, pointing out that they had a good working relationship with Idverde and their PET operative on the ground. When she spoke to Dean Sergeant, she said that she had taken the approach that if the Parish Council couldn’t retain its existing PET operative, he would “struggle to sell it” to her. The Council had already got “what we need and what we want”, she said. However, Dean Sergeant had mentioned to the Clerk in an email that their existing PET operative would be owned and managed by the Parish Council. The Clerk had pointed out that the Parish Council wouldn’t want any external interference, but Dean Sergeant had assured her that he couldn’t foresee that it would change at all.

Cllr Mehta said that they could amend the budget later, feeling that they could reduce the precept increase. He felt that those last remarks from Dean Sergeant regarding the PET should put members “at ease”. He said that he would like to put it forward to go through to a vote.

Cllr Vidor asked which package the councillors were going to vote on.

Cllr Parker asked to know what the approximate cost of the current PET was, without any extras. The Clerk said that it was £57,000. Cllr Parker then asked for a guarantee that the Parish Council could keep its existing PET operative and way of working with him. The Clerk told Cllr Parker that was very important and wasn’t sure if Dean Sergeant had put together a package of what the Parish Council wanted. She added that it would depend on what the Parish Council wanted to buy into, but that once the decision had been made, they could obtain a costing for its existing PET operative.

Cllr Davies said that there was a package put together, described by Dean Sergeant as “the menu” – each of the bits of the menu had a price, and the Parish Council could just place an order for what it wanted.

Cllr Davies said that he would like to propose that the Parish Council retain the PET team as it stood, but enhanced with an apprentice for the same price, which he pointed out was “more than we get”. He added that the caveat of this would be that their existing PET operative would cost more than the menu price. Together with that, he proposed a full enforcement officer, together with CCTV. Having listened to the Clerk, he said, he would compromise and have a part-time public realms officer – not necessarily around Lawley, he said, but there are other parts of the parish as well, and that Overdale, The Rock, and Dawley Bank would benefit hugely from that.

The Clerk said that the Parish Council’s PET operative did “an awful lot of work” on Overdale, The Rock, Newdale, and Dawley Bank, not just in Lawley.

Cllr Davies said that his comments were regarding the public realms officer rather than the PET. The Clerk asked if he was proposing two days a week for the liaison officer. Cllr Davies clarified that he was proposing buying into the full PET, full enforcement package, but only a part-time public realms officer. This, he said, would give the Parish Council a slight saving on what had been assumed in the budget, and he added that he thought there were further savings that could be made.

Cllr Yorke said that he felt that £75,000 in the budget was “a little too high”; he asked what would happen in three years’ time when the Parish Council started to pay full price for the package and questioned if it could continue to provide the

same level of service. He added that this was his personal view. He asked if “we are saying we aren’t going to be over £75,000, but we aren’t going to be far off it”.

Cllr Parker said that he would like some clarification – he asked if the Parish Council spent £75,000 on the proposed package, would it then no longer need to spend £57,000 on the PET. He asked whether it was £13,000 of additional spending.

The Clerk said that without 50/50 match funding it would be, but that if the Parish Council spent £75,000, it would only be committing to £35,000, adding that the Parish Council would be making a saving while having far more services available.

Cllr Parker asked if £75,000 was the total amount for the CAT, or just the Parish Council contribution.

Cllr Davies explained that the cost to the Parish Council would be £75,000, but would it not be £75,000 plus £57,000 for the PET. It “would be getting everything else on top”, he said. Regarding Cllr Yorke’s point, Cllr Davies said that there would be no expectation that it would continue in three years’ time, and that a conversation would need to be had then. He said that he thought a full-time public realms officer cost around £30,000; if the Parish Council only paid for half of one, then that would be a saving of £15,000.

Cllr Yorke said that his worry was that in three years’ time, without match-funding the kind of service the Parish Council would be getting would cost £150,000. His worry was that “if you get used to the good life, you want it to continue” – he wondered if residents would want that level of service to continue even after match-funding had ended and the CAT cost the Parish Council the full £150,000.

Cllr Shaun Davies **PROPOSED** that Lawley and Overdale Parish Council commit to the CAT package (£65,000 package including existing PET operative enhanced with an apprentice, full enforcement officer together with CCTV, and a part-time public realm officer). Cllr John Yorke **SECONDED. ALL IN FAVOUR.**

N.B. Cllrs Parker and Vidor clarified that their ‘yes’ votes were subject to the Parish Council retaining its existing PET operative.

VOTE PASSED – ALL IN FAVOUR

2020/112 FINANCE

a) Invoices for payment (sent to Councillors for viewing followed by Authorisation)

The Clerk confirmed that the invoices had been sent to councillors for authorisation. The Clerk added that an additional invoice had been sent to councillors for authorisation earlier that day (21 January), regarding the deep-clean that had been required at Lawley Community Centre following the COVID-19 incident (she added that the deep-clean had since been completed) and requested that councillors authorised it for payment.

Cllr Vidor suggested that more councillors needed to be granted access to the bank, particularly as COVID-19 had altered their usual way of approving invoices. The Clerk pointed out that all members aside from Cllr Yorke (she added that the necessary forms had been completed prior to Cllr Yorke joining the Parish Council) have been granted Internet access to the bank, though there were only three main users – Cllrs Greenaway, Parker, and Vidor. She added that all members should have received emails from the bank prompting them to setup their accounts. The facility was in place but had not been exercised, she said.

Cllr Mehta asked how he could get a copy of that email. The Clerk said that she was unsure during the pandemic, but an email had been sent by the bank in 2019.

b) Draft Precept/Budget Ratification 2021/2022

The Clerk asked that they begin with the main Parish Council budget.

Cllr Davies announced to the Chairman via text message that he was unable to see or hear attendees at 18:47.

The Clerk said that the only changes she had made to the main budget had been an action to reduce the potential of any perceived staffing pay rise from 3% to 1.5%. This had come down from £119,000 to £112,000, including uplift. This did not have much difference on the bottom line, she said, at 23p a week.

Cllr Yorke asked about community environment, and whether it should be going down to £63,000. The Clerk answered yes. Cllr Yorke explained that he was asking, “as a matter of principle”, about whether they were allowed to use the “loan repayments” heading, on the basis that the Parish Council didn’t have any loan repayment commitments.

Cllr Davies re-joined the meeting at 18:50.

The Clerk explained to Cllr Yorke that she had titled the heading “loan repayments” as a contingency.

Cllr Parker said he was not sure if this was an external document, and that if not, maybe “loan repayments” should instead be listed as a community centre cost.

The Clerk clarified that it was not a public document – the only public document, she explained, was a generalised breakdown intended as a leaflet in council tax statements, so they could “call it what [they] liked”.

Cllr Vidor said it would help to understand if it was named something more specific. The Clerk agreed and made changes to the document during the meeting.

Cllr Davies wished to mention an email the Clerk had sent about a business grant application and asked if had been discussed yet. Cllr Mehta said no. Cllr Davies said that he could provide some information that would indicate the chances of success against that application were very high, so the budget should assume it would be coming through. The grant was designed with those sorts of community facilities in mind, he added. He suggested that they could look at that element of the budget and “do something creative” to reduce the overall precept.

The Clerk asked Cllr Davies if it was proposed that the grant would be paid in the current financial year (2020/2021), or after April, in the next financial year (2021/2022). Cllr Davies said that it would almost certainly be paid in the current financial year, unless the Parish Council did not wish to receive it then. The Clerk pointed out that if they wanted the grant to have an impact on the forthcoming budget and reduce the precept, it would be better to have the grant paid on or after 1 April 2021. The Clerk asked if Cllr Davies wanted her to include it as an income for the new year, to which Cllr Davies said yes. The Clerk then asked if the proposed figure would be £4,000 – Cllr Davies said yes, and that anything more would be “a bonus”.

After a pause, the Clerk announced that she had changed the “loan repayments header” to read “community centre groundworks”. She had also changed the CAT package in the budget to £65,000 and added £4,000 income from the business grant application. She said these changes now resulted in a potential precept increase of 15p per week.

The Clerk asked if councillors have any comments on the main budget.

Cllr Parker asked what the precept was presently. The Clerk said that £314,105 was the proposal for the forthcoming year. Last year it was £280,645. She said that if councillors were to look at it as cost per household, last year it was £80.78, and this year it would be £88.83, or 15p per week. The Clerk asked if councillors were happy to accept the precept.

Cllr Davies explained that he did not wish to start a “massive debate about this” but wanted to make sure that members were clear on staffing. The budget, he said, assumed all the salaries staff were on presently, plus an incremental increase by 1 for every member of staff, which included the ones they had recommended at this meeting. The Clerk said yes. Cllr Davies asked what the Clerk had assumed regarding pay rises, to which the Clerk said 1.5%. Cllr Davies said that he had compromised to reach 1.5%, so they would have “plenty of wiggle room”.

Cllr Rob Parker **PROPOSED** accepting the 2021/2022 Parish Council Budget/Precept Increase with amendments made by the Clerk during the meeting. To request a precept of £314,105.00. Cllr John Yorke **SECONDED. ALL IN FAVOUR.**

ACTION: Clerk to scan and email the completed paperwork to Cllr Raj Mehta, for him to sign, scan, and return to the Clerk. Due by 1 February 2021.

c) *Annual internal Financial Risk and Health & Safety Evaluation 2020/2021*

The Clerk explained that an annual review has been conducted and minuted as part of the audit. The Clerk informed councillors that she had “gone through it line by line”, ensuring that the figures were updated. She asked members if there were any questions.

Cllr Parker said statements should be reconciled and independently reviewed; this would normally be done at Full Council meetings, but due to COVID-19 and the need for virtual Full Council meetings, they have been unable to do that for the past year. He wondered if the Council should acknowledge that.

The Clerk said that she had received an email for internal audit for this year and was hopeful they could get signatures. Cllr Parker suggested that they scan and send all the bank statements. In terms of control, there was a risk that the bank statement may indicate that the money was there when it wasn't, and they needed to think of some way of addressing that. The Clerk said that she thought they could do it in the same way as invoice authorisations. Cllr Mehta clarified that Cllr Parker was indicating that a line needed to be included about the impact of COVID-19 on that process.

The Clerk asked if councillors wanted her to send them everything that she had, so they would be able to see everything. Cllr Parker said that because of COVID-19 they had faced a number of challenges this year – they had not had regular finance meetings; they had not done the monthly check of bank statements against internal financial records. He said that was a weakness they had identified, so they needed to do that somehow. The Clerk said that she and the Deputy Clerk would work on that.

Cllr Lee Vidor **PROPOSED** adopting the Annual internal Financial Risk and Health & Safety Evaluation 2020/2021 document. Cllr John Yorke **SECONDED. ALL IN FAVOUR.**

2020/113 PROW Strategy/DMMO Consultation

a) PROW Strategy (Covering letter, LOPC PROW Assessment/PROW Consultation form

The Clerk explained that the PROW Strategy/DMMO Consultation was asking for the Parish Council's feedback on the policy and the process. The date for returns was 12 Feb. She and Cllr Mehta had spoken prior to the meeting and thought that the DMMO and PROW maps moving forward would be extremely important, as there are 27 public rights of way in the parish. The Clerk added that she had already alerted Andrew Careless (Public Rights of Way, TWC) that she had a lot of questions about the definitive PROW map, which differed from the Parish Council's records. She thought it would be prudent that, rather than "rush through this", a small working group to tackle the issue would be beneficial. She informed councillors that Cllr Jayne Greenaway had indicated that she would be quite happy to be part of it. The Clerk also thought that Cllr Yorke would be happy to be part of it. r

Cllr Parker volunteered to be part of the working group. He asked if there were significant problems that needed "some proper work". The Clerk said that there were discrepancies that could have a long-term impact, and that there are ones that are on the Parish Council's map but not on the definitive map. The Clerk proposed setting-up a working group and inviting Andrew Careless to a meeting as soon as possible. It was very important that their records matched, she added.

Cllr Mehta said that they could set up a working group, have a discussion, and report back to Full Council before any submissions were made. Cllr Yorke pointed out that the next Full Council meeting was not until 18 February, but comments needed to be submitted by 12 February, so it could not go to a Full Council meeting unless the submission was late. Cllr Mehta said that he felt that all members needed to be involved in that conversation, and that all councillors should agree and comment before submission.

Cllr Davies said that he didn't think the officers would "quibble over a few days"; he said that the Clerk should let them know that the Parish Council's submission would be a few days late, and if necessary, they could submit a draft. Cllr Mehta asked the Clerk to email them to let them know the Parish Council would be a few days late.

The Clerk asked if the working group would consist of the Clerk, and Cllrs Greenaway, Parker, and Yorke. Cllr Mehta indicated that he thought all councillors should be asked if they wished to take part. The Clerk asked for a decision at the current meeting, to "get the ball rolling".

Cllr Mehta agreed the initial working group of the Clerk and Cllrs Greenaway, Parker, and Yorke, and instructed councillors to contact the Clerk if they wished to join.

ACTION: The Clerk to email the PROW Strategy/DMMO Consultation to inform them that Lawley and Overdale Parish Council's comments would be submitted after 18 February, later than the 12 February deadline.

ACTION: The Clerk, and Cllrs Greenaway, Parker, and Yorke to form a working group to review the discrepancies on the DMMO and PROW definitive maps, and to draft a response to the consultation for the 18 February Full Council meeting.

2020/114 COUNCILLORS/WARD MEMBERS SESSION

Note: The Councillors Session and Ward Members Session were merged into one item.

Cllr Amrik Jhawar – reported that:

- He had identified an issue with a manhole cover at Birchfield Way, but he said it wasn't the responsibility of the Borough as the road/footpath had not yet been adopted. The Clerk explained that the Parish Council had received a couple of reports of issues with manhole covers – the one identified by Cllr Jhawar, and another on Strawberry Moor. Highways engineers had been contacted, and they indicated that the issues were on the remedial list. Engineers had knocked on residents' doors and informed them.
- There was an issue with rubbish at Princes End near the Wrekin View pub. The Clerk explained that the PET operative had removed around six fly-tips that week, and asked Cllr Jhawar if the rubbish he had reported consisted of a collection of black bin bags. Cllr Jhawar said no, it had been loose rubbish, possibly from inside a house and dumped outside.

Cllr Lee Vidor – reported that:

- There had been some work done on the trundle path, which he thought was “great”, as the Clerk and the PET operative had been pushing that issue for some time. The Clerk said that the PET officer had sent her a photograph of the path earlier that day; he had highlighted that it was a “good job they'd done it”, and that it had held up well after the unusual combination of heavy rain and snow the previous night.

Cllr John Yorke – reported that:

- Residents at Phase 11 were “beginning to see a few things and worrying”; he was still waiting to hear from TWC about any movement, but there was not a lot going on. The Clerk said that she had checked to see if there were any proposals for it to go to committee, but there was nothing now. They were still waiting for information on drainage, she added, and there was no update.

Cllr Rob Parker – reported that:

- He had intended to mention the work undertaken on the trundle path too. He said it was much better, with reduced mud, and he was “very pleased”.
- More dog waste bins may be needed in the area around Lavender Close. The Clerk explained that she had raised this with the developers, and also to the case officer when talking about bins across the phases. Lavender Close was not actually finished yet, she said – there are to be bins installed. She had also spoken to BVT, who had put something out on about locations for dog waste bins on Facebook. A BVT meeting was being set-up to look at possible locations, not all on land BVT is responsible for, so for further discussion.

Cllr Raj Mehta – reported that:

- He “accidentally” met with the new manager at Lawley Morrison's – it was not an arranged meeting, he said, but he “bumped into him” while he was shopping there. The manager would be in touch with the Parish Council shortly, he explained.
- He had received a call from a resident mentioning that she nearly got hit by a speeding vehicle on Dawley Road, and she was concerned about that. The resident had mentioned that “she hasn't seen the guys with the yellow jackets for a while”, with Cllr Mehta indicating that she was talking about Cllr Vidor's Community Speedwatch group. Cllr Vidor pointed out that the Community Speedwatch was not permitted to operate due to COVID-19.

2020/115

COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

a) Green Guarantee

Judy Parker, Facilities & Community Liaison Officer, explained that they were awaiting two outstanding quotes to come in regarding the tree survey, for the community garden. She said that Simon Bailey, Project, Events, & Engagement Officer, had put some great ideas together for work in the community garden, which would be presented at the next Full Council meeting in February.

She told councillors that a survey had been proposed and agreed with Cllr Davies regarding the St Heliers green space. The survey would be delivered to 124 residents by the end of January. The survey would be produced and delivered by the staff team. The closing date for responses would be 22 February. Cllr Mehta thanked staff for their work in delivering the surveys.

Jill Holland entered the meeting at 19:20.

Cllr Yorke asked Judy Parker and Cllr Davies, with regards to trees being provided by TWC to residents who had applied, whether the process had been delayed by COVID-19. Cllr Davies explained that it hadn't been delayed, but “massively oversubscribed”, so officers were working through a fair process of allocation.

Cllr Jhawar offered to help staff with delivering the surveys.

b) *Police/ASB survey meeting update*

The Clerk explained that the staff team had met virtually with the local police team. She pointed out that officers had been changed once again, despite Inspector Sean Brennan's earlier assurances that they would not be changed again.

The Clerk explained that Sergeant Jodie Davies was the new sergeant, Dave Worrall was the new Police Constable, and that she felt they were "quite on the ball". They discussed various things, and have had a newsletter from them, albeit "basic" – the Clerk said that they would happily work with them to enhance it in the future.

"Quite a number of things were covered", the Clerk said. The police wanted meetings with the Parish Council every eight weeks, which the Clerk felt was another good thing, as officers did not have the opportunity to drop into the Parish Council office like they used to due to COVID-19. The ASB survey was discussed, she said, and a number of common problems were identified across the borough. The Clerk said that the Parish Council did say to residents that something would be put out, and asked councillors what the Parish Council should publish about it. Her thought was that the staff team should look through the results again, look at what was discussed with the police, and draft something for publication – she added that she wanted it to be positive.

Cllr Parker said that he thought it was good that the Parish Council was telling people what it was doing, but that they needed to be careful not to raise expectations.

Cllr Davies said that he thought this issue was discussed this at length in previous meetings. The danger, he said, was that people would "just want us to do that work as bread and butter". He added that he thought the Parish Council's social media was fantastic, though he thought social media should be more positive, rather than focussing on small issues that affect everybody.

2020/116

CORRESPONDENCE

- The Clerk said that she had received an acknowledgement about a claim the Parish Council had put in about interruption of insurance cover. She said that they should hopefully receive some money back covering April – September 2020 following the Supreme Courts ruling against the Insurance Sector.
- The Clerk said that she had put something out about the hackney carriage/private hire licencing consultation. While members could reply individually, she said that if any councillors had comments she could do a collated approach. The responses are due in by 10 February.
- The Clerk informed members that the Parish Council had received an invitation to set a date for an internal audit for 2021 and asked if members were "happy to go with Diane under the current climate", or if they wished for her to approach other auditors.

Cllr Parker said that he was happy to go with Diane because of the situation but noted that some training he'd attended suggested that the auditors should be changed every three or four years, which was something he felt the Council should look at. The Clerk agreed, noting that this was the reason she had said "under the current climate".

The Clerk said that she would try to book something in for the end of May, so that they would not be under too much pressure to get materials ready for the external audit – the dates haven't moved for that, she noted, but that could prove to be fluid as well.

ACTION: Clerk to arrange booking internal auditors for some time near the end of May 2021.

Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960

In view of the confidential nature of the business about to be transacted it is requested that the public and press should not be present

2020/117

CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS

Staff members Simon Bailey, Jill Holland, Matt Lever, and Judy Parker were asked to depart the meeting at 19:32, to enable councillors to discuss recommendations from the Personnel Committee.

Items were noted

2020/118

AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING

- COUNCILLORS TO EMAIL ANY AGENDA ITEMS FOR THE NEXT MEETING TO THE CLERK

- COMMUNITY GARDEN

2020/119 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was **NOTED** that the **FULL COUNCIL** parish meeting would take place on **THURSDAY 18th FEBRUARY 2021 at 6pm. Due to the uncertainties created by COVID-19, the venue is likely to be virtual.**

The meeting closed at 19.52pm

Signed..... Chair

Date.....