



**Minutes of the REMOTE Full Council meeting held via GoToMeetings at Leonard Smith House, West Centre Way
On Thursday 18th February 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 Jayne Greenaway, Cllr Amrik Jhawar, Cllr Raj Mehta, Cllr. Rob Parker, Cllr Lee Vidor, Cllr John Yorke

CLERK:

Sharon George, Clerk

IN ATTENDANCE

Jill Holland (Deputy Clerk)
Matt Lever (Admin Assistant)
Judy Parker (Facilities & Community Liaison Officer)
Cllr Eileen Callear (Ward Member for Ketley and Overdale)
Cllr Jacqui Seymour (Ward Member for Wrockwardine)

2020/120 CHAIR'S WELCOME

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2020/121 APOLOGIES

Apologies received from:

Cllr Jayne Greenaway (Borough commitment) - *subsequently joined the meeting at 18:55*

Cllr Mike Tyler (personal commitments)

Cllr Jacqui Seymour departed the meeting at 18:51.

Cllr Eileen Callear departed the meeting at 19:02.

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.

2020/122 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor	Interest	Declaration	Minute no.
John Yorke	Community Facility	LVCA Member	2020/122

2020/123 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

No public present.

2020/124 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

Cllr Amrik Jhawar raised an issue with the wording over 2020/114, where a "borough councillor" was referred to as not having responsibility for an issue, instead of simply the "Borough [Council]". Cllr John Yorke highlighted a mistake in 220/110, where "CCTV officers" were referred to erroneously – the Parish Council would be buying into two CCTV *cameras* via the Community Action Team (CAT), not *officers*. Subject to these amendments, councillors agreed with the minutes.

The minutes from the **Full Council Meeting** held on **21st January 2021** were **APPROVED**. It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes be signed and **ADOPTED** as a true record. This was **PROPOSED** by Cllr Shaun Davies and **SECONDED** by Cllr Amrik Jhawar.

2020/125 DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Clerk explained that the Development Plan had been raised at the previous meeting, and that it was being done “a little backwards”, as the Parish Council had already set the budget. The Clerk said that the Parish Council needed to identify items for a development plan, which would help when looking at targets for the new financial year.

Cllr Raj Mehta suggested that this item be deferred, as two councillors were not in attendance. Cllr Shaun Davies agreed, highlighting that the Council was “only a group of eight and two aren’t here”, adding that the development plan “was about informing decisions for the next 12 months”. He suggested tackling it at a working group meeting so they could have “a frank conversation as we did last time”.

Cllr Amrik Jhawar agreed that all councillors should be in attendance to discuss these matters.

The Clerk asked that, as staff appraisals needed to be done by April, if councillors could have the meeting “in a timely manner”. Cllr Mehta agreed.

ACTION: Clerk to arrange a date with all Councillors to meet to discuss the development plan for the Parish Council.

2020/126 FINANCE

- a) *Invoices for payment (sent to Councillors for viewing followed by Authorisation)*
- b) *Bank reconciliations sent to Councillors for viewing*

Cllr Mehta confirmed that invoices /bank reconciliations had been sent to all councillors for viewing and authorisation.

2020/127 PROW STRATEGY/DMMO CONSULTATION

Cllr Mehta asked councillors if they had any comments regarding the update that had been sent out from the PROW/DMMO working group. Councillors had no comments. The working group will meet again on 17th March to further the PROW identifications/modifications.

2020/128 CAT UPDATE

The Clerk informed councillors that she had been sent a “service-level agreement” (SLA) for the Community Action Team (CAT) from Telford & Wrekin Council (TWC). In the interim period, she had spoken to Debbie Germany, Phil Pritchard, and Paul Fenn, and she said that everything was “very positive and rolling forwards”.

The Clerk said that she did still have reservations, which she had raised in an email to all councillors prior to the Full Council meeting. Having read the job description for the Community Liaison Officer, the Clerk said that she was “still of the view that what we have works” and was unconvinced that the Parish Council needed “another level within that”. The Parish Council, she said, needed to think if it wanted “to spend nearly another £10,000 on something that may be surplus to requirements”.

Cllr Davies said that “from a procedural point, [councillors] have agreed this as a council, and this decision informed our budget, and there are rules around decisions that once they have been made, they can’t be reopened”. Regarding the Clerk’s points, Cllr Davies broke his response down into numbered points:

- 1) He felt that it was not the best idea for the Clerk to be involved in these activities when a new member of staff could pick them up cheaply, allowing the Clerk to do the work the Council “needed her to do as Clerk”.
- 2) “In the friendliest possible way”, he said, the Clerk and the Parish Council’s existing Parish Environmental Team (PET) “aren’t necessarily going to be here forever”, and he highlighted that the CAT was a three-year agreement. “This should be a decision about what works”, he said.
- 3) Finally, he said, this was “a package of support”, which was also linked to CCTV and an enforcement agenda. He said that this would be the first time, as a parish, they’d had “that enforcement angle in our bow”, so additional tasks would need to be picked up as part of that. His view was that they had already compromised on a part-time officer, and he thought “we should try and see how it goes”. If in six to twelve months’ time councillors changed their minds about having the officer, he said, the offer would be gone.

Cllr John Yorke said that he thought the Clerk’s point was relevant, and he had been “anti-total package” in the last meeting. “At the end of the day”, he said, “it is what it is”. The councillor said that he still had reservations, but the minutes from the previous meeting showed that he voted for it to be accepted. As he had voted for it, he said, it should go ahead, and “it will be for the next council to sort out after the next 2023 elections”.

Cllr Jhawar said that a decision had been made “and we should stick to that”.

Cllr Mehta thanked the Clerk for raising her points but said that the Council would be going ahead as previously decided.

The Clerk said that there was one other element in the agreement, which was in relation to the vehicles intended to be used – specifically, the agreement referenced providing electric vehicles for the PET operative. She had spoken with Debbie Germany and Phil Pritchard about the electric vehicles and learnt that they were “more like box vans than flat-bed pickups, as we have currently”. The existing PET operative had raised concerns when he heard these rumours, she said. It does say in the agreement “electric if possible”, she said, but added that if no-one was averse to keeping the vehicle the parish already had, she would need to give confirmation Phil Pritchard to confirm as much with Idverde. She asked if councillors were happy to carry on using the PET’s current vehicle rather than switching to an electric vehicle.

Cllr Rob Parker said that there were going to be a lot more people involved, and that they weren’t all going to fit in one van. He believed there would be four people involved. The Clerk said that this vehicle is specifically for the PET, which would involve the existing operative plus an apprentice. Cllr Parker said that he was not against electric vehicles but wanted to be clear that the Parish Council was going to retain its existing PET operative, as was agreed at the last meeting, and asked if this was in the contract. The Clerk said that it was in “Breakdown of Costs” on page six – there was an additional £2,000 item to retain the Parish Council’s existing PET operative. Cllr Parker said that he wanted enough time to “make sure this is exactly what we expect it to be, and we need to review everything”. The Clerk pointed out that this needed to be agreed as soon as possible.

Cllr Davies said that “councillors shouldn’t need to read the contract – that’s what we have staff for”. The Parish Council needed to retain its existing PET operative, he said, and that was reflected in the extra cost. He said that he agreed completely with Cllr Parker about electric vehicles, and he thought that the enforcement/realms officer should have electric vehicles. “This is the third time this has been raised and we need to crack on as soon as possible,” he added, pointing out that some recruitment needed to take place.

Cllr Mehta asked the Clerk for clarification on what it was she needed. The Clerk said that she had agreed to liaise with Debbie Germany as soon as possible. Having spoken to Phil Pritchard, who had looked at the SLA for the CAT as well as the Parish Council’s original SLA for the PET, and the SLA the Parish Council had with Idverde currently, the Clerk was quite happy with the terms.

Cllr Parker said that he was happy so long as the points he had made were addressed.

The Clerk said that the agreement needed the Parish Council Chairman’s signature – Cllr Mehta said that he would sign it after the meeting had finished.

Cllr Yorke pointed out that the document councillors had been sent had a draft watermark on it. The Clerk said that she would remove the draft watermark.

ACTION: Clerk to send a non-draft copy of the CAT agreement to the Chairman for signing.

2020/129 COUNCILLORS SESSION

Cllr Shaun Davies – reported that:

- The new business that had opened on Dawley Bank, which was a coffee and cake shop at that time, was proving to be successful and popular. It was operating as a takeaway, he said, which it could do without planning consent, but the owner had got a planning application for the other side of the building to be used for food. He had spoken to the owner and suggested he do some pre-planning engagement with residents first.
- He had had a “really good” conversation with the people at Dawley Bank Baptist Church; the extension was “really coming on now”, he said, adding that it was “really positive”. He was still trying to persuade them to have a conversation with the Parish Council about cemetery maintenance.
- He knew from speaking to Ladygrove Primary School, and other primary schools in the area, that laptops remained a “big issue” for them. There was a huge demand for laptops, he said. While obviously they’d had the donations from Lawley and Overdale Parish Council and the Borough Council, they had asked him to mention if there was a possibility for further help, as it would be greatly received. He added that he recognised that this would need to be an agenda item, however.

Cllr Amrik Jhawar – reported that:

- There were no issues. He had noticed that the fly-tipping by Wrekin View had been cleared, so “that was fine now”.

Cllr Lee Vidor – reported that:

- He wanted to say thanks to staff and the Clerk for their help with a sewage issue on Dobbins Lane which had now been dealt with and residents were happy to have a contact to go to in the future.
- Regarding Wooding Drive, someone had contacted him about the state of the tarmac there. He didn't know if there was a work schedule available from the developer group which could be shared. The Clerk said that she had spoken to the developers the previous day, and Phase Eight was still being built out, so there was not a timeline for the road. Once the David Wilson element was completed, she said – hopefully by the end of April or early May at the latest – roads would be on a timeline for tarmacking and finishing. There was not a definite timeline, she added, but the developers were aware. Cllr Vidor said that he would go back to the resident.
- Regarding Glendale, “the Meadows part”, a resident had approached him about some recent gas repairs and said that tarmac on the footpath had been left in disrepair. He asked who we would need to talk to about the issue – Telford & Wrekin Council, or Cadent? The Clerk said that Cadent would have been working under permit, so the work should have been inspected once it was finished. She asked Cllr Vidor to send her an email with the specifics, so she could get in touch with a permit officer.

ACTION: Cllr Vidor to send the Clerk an email with specific details about the Glendale gas repair issues. The Clerk will then contact a permit officer.

- Regarding Peppermill, he said that it was great to see that railings had “popped-up” from the original scheme the Parish Council had put towards. His only concern was the news about how it was funded and how it came about. He said that Cllr Paul Watling had come to January's Full Council meeting and “pitched to us” the £500,000 [Lawley and Lightmoor] Community Fund and had told councillors then that the Parish Council would have a “great partnership” around how it would be spent. He highlighted that the Parish Council was not involved yet, however, and wondered if there was any update about that. Cllr Mehta said to “make a note and get an email from Councillor Watling”.

The Clerk said that following the meeting with Cllr Watling in January, she had chased him up to say the Parish Council had not received an invite. Cllr Watling had got in touch with Angie Astley, who had asked Jas Bedesha to get in touch with the Parish Council to say that invitations were in progress. The Clerk said that she did ask Jas Bedesha about the safety scheme and how the Parish Council hadn't been invited yet decisions had been taken. She had also shared an email from Cllr Jayne Greenaway about the issue with councillors prior to the meeting.

Cllr Davies said that invitations would go out imminently, but that Cllr Watling had clearly said that the Parish Council would be “one partner in that scheme” – it “will be Telford & Wrekin Council's funding, and up to them how to spend that money”. He said that the safety railings had been an urgent need which TWC had identified, so rather than go through governance and red tape, they “went ahead and did it”. He added that he didn't think councillors should balk at the process.

Cllr Vidor said that it was “great”, but that Cllr Watling was “very clear” that TWC would not make any decisions on how the money would be spent, but that the partnership would. He added that the actual railings that were put in had been proposed by Peppermill scheme already.

Cllr Davies said that it was the decision of the Borough Council how to spend the money after listening to partners. He added that invitations would be sent out imminently – maybe within the next 24 hours.

Cllr Yorke said that at the last LVCA meeting they'd received a list of the people making up the committee – he thought that it was about 12 people, with three or four from the Borough, one from developers, and one from the LVCA. He said that he thought that where Cllr Vidor was coming from was how much of the £500,000 was gone that “we don't even know about”. He added that it took a long time to agree spending and thought that it was “rightly a concern”. Cllr Yorke then proceeded to deliver his own report.

Cllr John Yorke – reported that:

- Residents of Phase 11 wanted to know what was happening and what was going on. He thought that a meeting had taken place with Homes England a week or two earlier, which was “not particularly conclusive to the point of people putting their money where their mouth is.”

Cllr Rob Parker – reported that:

- A few people had been mentioning the increasingly bad state of dog mess around the parish, and that it “seems to be getting worse and worse”. He said that it was good that the Parish Council was going to have “all this resource in terms of the new enforcement team”, but that it might need up to update signage about penalties, as some of it was faded, especially moving into summer with kids around. Cllr Mehta asked Cllr Parker if he was proposing looking at dog fouling signage. Cllr Parker said yes. He added that there seemed to be plenty of bins around and that they were being regularly emptied. Cllr Mehta asked the Clerk to investigate the signage. The Clerk said that

she had spoken to Paul Fenn, who would be managing the parish with regard to enforcement officers. She added that Paul Fenn had already had an invitation to the Parish Council's next meeting with local police, as it will be "a targeted and focused approach on a number of things". Regarding signage, she said, she could contact Kay Steele, as the signs originally came from the Borough. If they were not available, the Parish Council could source some itself.

ACTION: The Clerk to contact Kay Grice, TWC, and enquire about replacement dog fouling signs.

The Clerk reminded the Chair that Cllr Greenaway had sent in a report for the meeting as she was unable to attend and asked if this should be read out. Cllr Mehta said that as it had been circulated to all members there was no need.

Cllr Jayne Greenaway – Unable to attend meeting but report recorded for the purpose of the minutes

Please would you register my apologies for the meeting as I am unable to attend due to a clash with T&W Boundary Committee meeting which I will need to attend.

As I'm not able to be there I've just a couple of points which I would like to raise in the Cllr session if it can be read out? Reading last meetings minutes (as I was unable to be there due to being unwell) the notes from Cllr Watling referred to the New Community Funding which we had been waiting to hear about.

He mentioned a stakeholder group being formed (has the PC been invited yet?) I see that residents' groups and BVT (a Management Company) have been consulted but not elected representatives of the PC.

Having seen the closure notices on Peppermill and wondering why and then the T&W public post regarding the outstanding works as part of the 'New Community Fund' could I ask for some clarification on this?

The works notice on site was erected three weeks ago (with no formal notification of closure) this must have been put forward before the briefing, why was this not referenced in the notes? Or am I missing something?

Are we to ever be part of a stakeholder group or is this just for the Councillors named on the post on social media?

Why are we seeing it from that source?

Very disappointed!

I would like this raised at council also.

I've now spoken to KS whose friends' husband was driving the van he was waiting to turn left into Synders the car was travelling from Lawley Lights to M54, the wheels skidded, he went across four lanes and into the van, the sheer force sent the van up in the air and it was on top of one of the poles, into a house. He then went to the van to wrestle the dash-cam out. Two male/females did a runner, male was picked up by a car travelling at speed on Dawley Rd don't know where the girl is. It nearly took out pedestrians on the footpath. Police haven't even put out the numbers.

We don't need traffic calming or restrictions as these criminals don't heed it. We need cameras to catch them.

Van's driver got broken ribs so far as can tell.

A miracle many weren't killed.

2020/130

WARD MEMBERS SESSION

Cllr Amrik Jhawar – reported that:

- Two grit bins in the parish needed to be refilled. The Clerk said that they had been refilled, but two individuals had been reported emptying the grit afterwards, which our PET operative had confirmed. The police were aware of the issue.

Cllr Eileen Callear – reported that:

- Things had been "relatively quiet", just general correspondence. She had received one from Barratt Close, and would work with the Clerk to put a response together.
- She knew that the Newdale NEAP was on the agenda, and a ward member briefing would be held the next week.
- She wondered about the Carpenter Centre and if it was possible to follow-up on that and move things forward. The Clerk said that she'd had responses from Cllrs Callear and Jhawar but did not receive anything from Cllr Mark Boylan. She would follow up with TWC and send out some further dates for a meeting.

Cllr Jacqui Seymour – reported that:

- Not too much to report, though she believed that the tree planting had been going ahead and thought it would look "very nice".

- The Trundle path had been completely reopened; work had been carried out to sort out the flooding on the bit that is actually within Little Wenlock Parish. She thanked the PET operative for “keeping a watchful eye on what was going on there”.
- She was a bit intrigued about what was happening on Peppermill, as she didn’t know anything about it. The Clerk told her that the first they knew was when signs had appeared; she had raised it with Highways, as she had noticed the railings had gone in a week ago despite the original date being 15 February. Adam Brookes had replied to say they had a slot in the works so decided to start early, but he did not know that the Parish Council had received no notification of any works, and he was going to raise it with Balfour Beatty.

2020/131

COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

a) *Green Guarantee – St Saviours update*

Judy Parker (Facilities & Community Liaison Officer) explained that staff had sent out 140 surveys and had received about 40 responses. There had been “some very positive comments”, she said, but “only one person wanted a full football pitch”. The survey’s closing date was on 21 February; she was collating responses and would email councillors so that they could see what residents preferred. Ms Parker thought that the preferred option according to the results she had seen up until that point was “a bench and a path through the middle of the green”. She added that it had been a “very useful exercise”.

ACTION: Judy Parker to email councillors the results of the St Saviours/St Heliers survey.

b) *Community Garden presentation*

Judy Parker displayed the Community Garden PowerPoint presentation that had been shared with councillors prior to the meeting and explained that it was a series of suggestions that Simon Bailey (Projects, Events, and Engagement Officer) had put together to further improve the Community Garden. The ideas had been discussed by the staff team, and the ideas were intended to enhance the current facilities. No prices had been put down against the ideas yet, she explained, as it was hoped that councillors would put forward their comments and any suggestions with which the team could move forward, and the costs would then be investigated. The suggestions included both sides of the garden, and various ways in which it could be enhanced. She asked for any comments from councillors.

Cllr Mehta said that he would look at the presentation in detail later, and thanked staff for “coming together”. He added that he wanted to do a “walk around” of the Community Garden with either Ms Parker or Mr Bailey when the lockdown was over, as it is “always better to have a look on the ground”.

Cllr Vidor said that there were a lot of good ideas. He asked about the side of the garden with the bridge, and if there was anything that could be done to formalise it and make it a more welcoming entrance. He added that he thought the bridge entrance was “a bit scary” and wondered if it could be made it more welcoming. Ms Parker said that some suggestions had been put together for the bridge side to identify it more clearly as a different area. She added that it might be an idea to put the fairy garden element there. She asked councillors what they thought of the suggestion of having community volunteers.

Cllr John Yorke said that he thought an ‘arch’ had been mentioned. He said that he was conscious of anti-social behaviour and damage problems if so and wondered if it would be beyond the Parish Council’s means to contact the people who had provided the War Memorial; perhaps they could provide the garden with something simple that could “withstand the rigours of teenage troublemakers”, he suggested. He added that the arch was a lovely idea, but he was worried about “how gutsy would it be”. Ms Parker said that it would be a good idea to ask the War Memorial contractors.

Judy Parker said that the staff team had also discussed the idea of a metal memorial tree, so that people could put a memento on it as a form of remembrance. She said that they had also looked at a couple of grants, so when those were open for applications, they could investigate those more closely, as well as other ways of getting funding.

Cllr Mehta asked for costings to be provided on what Cllr Yorke had mentioned.

Cllr Davies said that the presentation was “first-class”, and said well done, as it gave a feeling of space and ideas. He thought that there was a missing link regarding consulting with residents around the ideas however. He said that the people who lived in proximity to the site should be asked “really early”, adding that the last thing they wanted to do was to produce something positive, but that wasn’t positive for the people who lived by it. Around the budget, he said, if the proposed improvements were a priority then they could think about how the budget could be used to make them a reality. He added that it was a good start and informed the staff team “well done everybody”. Ms Parker said that the presentation was purely the work of Mr Bailey, so the rest of the staff couldn’t accept any praise.

Cllr Parker asked about the long-term ownership of the piece of land on which the Community Garden was situated. In the past, he said, they had looked to get it registered as a village green, but it didn't have 20 years of history – it has that now, however, so he felt it was something they should look into, especially if they plan to invest in improvements. The Clerk explained that the land was under licence from TWC, so they could provide evidence of use, but the Parish Council had only held the land since 2017. She said that she was happy to investigate the process but added that it was not the Parish Council's land, and that she was not sure who to speak to in TWC.

The Clerk asked Cllr Davies if he knew anyone at the Council. Cllr Davies told the Clerk to contact him, adding that if the Parish Council was interested and wanted to invest in it, the best way to protect the land was to either buy it or own a lease on it. He didn't know the details, but he imagined that it would be controversial if a licence was there. He said that there were other ways to protect green spaces, as part of the project to make sure it is protected for generations to come.

The Clerk told Cllr Parker that she would investigate it via the Open Spaces Society as well as the Borough. Cllr Parker said that he was happy, "so long as its protected".

ACTION: Clerk to contact the War Memorial contractors to enquire about how much it would cost to install a metal archway on the Community Garden.

ACTION: The Clerk to contact Cllr Davies to find out who to contact at TWC about protecting the Community Garden land.

ACTION: The Clerk to investigate other means of protecting the Community Garden land.

c) LCC Users – review of usage re Covid19

Judy Parker explained that Puddleducks was on half-term break at that time, so earlier that week she had visited Lawley Community Centre (LCC) to complete a health and safety check and found that all was well. As of 18 February, there had only been one case of COVID-19 at LCC, which had been a young child, so Ms Parker felt they had "done extremely well". She had kept in contact with LCC's evening users, but they weren't expecting the LCC to open at the moment. It had been determined that reopening LCC would be a discussion item at the February Full Council meeting, but Ms Parker said that the staff team felt that would be best to wait and see what the Prime Minister would announce on the following Monday – adding that hopefully a roadmap to ease us out of lockdown would be announced, at which point the Parish Council could discuss letting evening users back in.

Cllr Jacqui Seymour departed the meeting at 18:51.

d) Newdale NEAP update

The Clerk said that she had emailed councillors an update from a meeting held on this subject and pointed out that it was now up to Derek Owen to come up with plans for consideration - as the NEAP would affect a wide area, it would have to go out to consultation, she added. The Clerk said that she wondered if it would be useful for Cllr Callear to see the notes from the meeting as well before the councillor's own meeting the next week. Cllr Callear said yes.

Cllr Jayne Greenaway joined the meeting at 18:55.

ACTION: Clerk to send notes of the Newdale NEAP meeting to Councillor Eileen Callear.

2020/132

CORRESPONDENCE

a) Winter Maintenance

The Clerk said that the parish had only experienced two snow events so far, but just in case there were further events she wanted to raise the issue at Full Council. The Clerk explained that she was aware of what the Borough winter maintenance policy was, as well as the gritting routes, but said that "residents' expectations exceed that". The PET operative usually clears snow and ice from the slopes on the four footbridges in the parish, if not the bridges themselves, and he also undertook work around the school. The PET operative had been approached by residents regarding the rear of Newdale Primary School; the route to the school path wasn't done at all, she said, and the PET operative had done it on two occasions.

The Clerk had contacted the Borough and asked if it should be on their gritting route, as apparently it wasn't, and neither were the footbridges or the slopes up to them. The Clerk received a response of no, "we don't do that sort of thing", but they were more than happy for the PET operative to do it. The Clerk then asked if rock salt could be provided from the Borough depot, and they said no, even though the areas in question were Borough Council-owned.

The Clerk said that the cost of a rock salt pallet was £243. She was “quite happy that [the PET operative] was helping out”, but asked councillors if the Parish Council should be providing that rock salt separately.

Cllr Vidor asked if there was anywhere available to store rock salts. The Clerk said that they had a shed behind LCC; she added that the Parish Council did purchase some rock salt three years ago to do the footway in front of Lawley Primary School, for use by the caretaker, but the PET operative had since used it when needed. The Clerk said that she had chased Simon Wiley at the Borough Council regarding snow wardens but had been told that she couldn't have their details due to GDPR – Mr Wiley had said he would write to the snow wardens and ask them to contact the Parish Council on their own, but at that time none of them had done so.

Cllr Davies pointed out that as the Parish Council was “moving to a CAT level”, they should be talking about this issue at a strategic level, rather than as a correspondence item, about how to move forward. He pointed out that regarding the snow wardens, there were issues around data protection, as snow wardens weren't part of the Parish but the Borough. He said that they had been contacted asking them to get in touch with the Parish Council, but it was “their prerogative” if they chose not to do so. He added that he thought this should be done “in a partnership way” rather than under correspondence, “where we can't make decisions anyway”.

Cllr Jayne Greenaway asked what the provision was under the Safe Routes for School initiative, adding that she did not know and wanted clarification.

Cllr Davies said that he didn't know “off the top of his head”. Cllr Davies said that he felt that “the problem is that we go around asking questions that we don't know the answers to, rather than doing it in a positive way”. He said that we should contact the officer at the Borough instead, adding that “we end up bashing the Borough Council without getting anywhere”.

The Clerk pointed out that she did contact the officer at the Borough, and was told no.

Cllr Davies said that he would raise the issue with Simon Wiley.

b) Overdale support re: Easter Event

Judy Parker informed councillors that the Parish Council had been approached by residents asking for support with an Easter event. If councillors agreed, she said, the parish could support them with around £200 of donations, as it did for Halloween and Christmas before.

Cllr Mehta said that he was “happy with that”.

Cllr Yorke said that it was a “rather nasty situation”, bearing in mind the concerns he had after a Christmas event, where a collection was taken and then donated to a private organisation. He said that he was happy to subsidise these events, but that the Parish Council would have to be 100% certain that “not a penny is collected from parents”. He continued to say that the Light Up Lawley campaign was already on Facebook saying it would have Mr Hoppity going around, and his concern was that the same thing could happen with that group again. Ms Parker said that the Overdale group was nothing like that and added that the Parish Council would be providing them with physical goods to use on an Easter egg hunt, not money.

Cllr Mehta said that he was happy for the staff team to carry on.

ACTION: Staff team to arrange physical donations of circa £200 in support of the Overdale community Easter event.

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

2020/133

CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS

Councillor Eileen Callear departed the meeting at 19:02.

Items were noted.

2020/134

AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING

- RESUMPTION OF FACE-TO-FACE MEETINGS, PER SALC UPDATED REGULATIONS
- COUNCILLORS TO EMAIL ANY AGENDA ITEMS FOR THE NEXT MEETING TO THE CLERK

2020/135

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

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

The meeting closed at 19:10.

Signed..... Chair

Date.....