



**Minutes of the REMOTE Full Council meeting held via GoToMeetings at Leonard Smith House, West Centre Way  
On Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> April 2021**

*Due to the current Covid-19 epidemic and the changes in legislation dated 7<sup>th</sup> 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 Raj Mehta, Cllr. Rob Parker, Cllr Lee Vidor, Cllr John Yorke

**CLERK:**

Sharon George, Clerk

**IN ATTENDANCE**

Simon Bailey (Projects, Events, and Engagement Officer)

Jill Holland (Deputy Clerk)

Matt Lever (Admin Assistant)

Judy Parker (Facilities & Community Liaison Officer)

Jacqui Seymour (Ward Councillor, Wrockwardine)

**2020/153 CHAIR'S WELCOME**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

**2020/154 APOLOGIES**

Apologies received from:

Cllr Jayne Greenaway (apologies received by Clerk, but cancelled due to attendance)

Cllr Amrik Jhawar (personal commitments)

Cllr Mike Tyler (personal commitments)

*Cllr Jacqui Seymour departed the meeting at 18:56.*

*Cllr Shaun Davies 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.*

**2020/155 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor	Interest	Declaration	Minute no.
Raj Mehta	Planning	Member of Planning Committee	2020/155
John Yorke	Community Facility	LVCA Member	2020/155

**2020/156 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

No public present.

**2020/157 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

The minutes from the **Full Council Meeting** held on **18<sup>th</sup> March 2021** 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 Lee Vidor.

**2020/158 FINANCE**

a) *Invoices for payment (sent to councillors for viewing followed by authorisation)*

Cllr Rob Parker explained that before he was happy to authorise invoices for payment at the bank, he would like the Full Council to approve them. Then he would be happy to authorise them, he said.

Cllr Raj Mehta asked if councillors were happy to do that, and there were no comments. He took the silence to mean that they were happy.

**ACTION: Councillors to approve invoices for payment before Cllr Parker authorises them at the bank.**

*b) Bank reconciliations sent to councillors for viewing*

Cllr Parker said that he had not yet had chance to look at the bank reconciliations to cross-check them. Cllr Mehta said that he hadn't either. Cllr John Yorke said that there was "nothing much wrong with them". He explained that "one or two of them were rather faint and didn't produce very well, so [he] had to make some assumptions", but they seemed to be ok. He had to "guess" what they were saying in one or two places, he added.

The Clerk first referred back to the previous agenda item; she explained that they had another invoice come in late that afternoon, which she'd like to get processed. Cllr Mehta asked if that was what Jill Holland had sent out. The Clerk said no, it was for purchase of the bench for St Saviours – she had sent a *pro forma* invoice that needed payment prior to dispatch. It had not been sent out yet, she said, as it was not processed yet. Cllr Mehta said once received, members should send comments to the Clerk.

Returning to the current agenda item, the Clerk said that the Unity Trust statements were "the ones from online". Ms Holland had been back in office that day, the Clerk explained, and they had "half a statement for one account". She had reconciled the bank, so once the proper statements were in, she would add them to the file.

Cllr Parker asked if they could be added to next month's agenda or sent out. The Clerk said she would send them out so he could see that "they do actually match". Cllr Mehta said to put it on the next agenda for comments. Cllr Parker said that it was important for bank statements to match.

The Clerk said she sent out a request regarding the scheduled finance meeting; to give them time to get year-end paperwork in order for the committee to look at, she had requested the meeting be moved 29 April. Three members could make it but two could not, however, and one councillor had not replied. She said it would be "technically quorate" however. Cllr Parker had told the Clerk that he was "happy either way", but she wished to see if other members were happy to go ahead.

Cllr Mehta said that he couldn't make it; he would "like to but can't", as he had back-to-back meetings on that day. He said that he would go with whatever members felt.

Cllr Shaun Davies said that he did email the Clerk; he had explained that there was going to be an additional Borough Council meeting that day, so he was unsure if that would affect people who previously thought they could attend. He suggested that it could be mitigated if the start time were brought forward or set back a little later. It was "no-one's fault at all", he said, but that given the "whole idea of having meetings in the diary was so they could keep the space", it was "unfortunate it was moved".

The Clerk said that she took "full responsibility", and said she had to send papers out to members. When the date was set back in January "it seemed like forever", she said, but "in real terms it has galloped on". The Clerk said that she took responsibility and apologised.

Cllr Mehta asked Cllr Parker if it could be brought forward earlier. Cllr Parker said he could do any time after 3pm. Cllr Yorke said that he could do "all day at the moment, so make a decision and [he would] put it in the diary". Cllr Davies asked if 3:15pm would be possible, but that he could do it. Cllr Lee Vidor said that closer to 3:15pm or 3:30pm would be better.

Cllr Mehta suggested 3:30pm to be "on the safe side".

**ACTION: Clerk to reschedule the finance committee meeting for 3:30pm on 29 April 2021.**

**2020/159**

**LAWLEY PARTNERSHIP BOARD (LPB)**

*a) Response received re questions raised by members (Appendix B)*

Cllr Mehta asked members for comments on Appendix B. There were no comments, so Cllr Mehta attempted to move on to Appendix C.

*b) Terms of reference V3 (Appendix C)*

Cllr Parker said that the document seemed to suggest that Cllr Mehta would “give a full account of the first board meeting”. They had “quite a discussion” at the previous Full Council meeting, he said. Cllr Mehta said that the minutes were sent out. The Clerk said that she hadn’t seen them. Cllr Mehta said he would get them and share them.

Cllr Mehta said questions raised had been put forward, and replies had been sent to members. Going forward, he said, for more clarity he would take that to next board meeting. He asked members if this was “OK”.

Cllr Parker said that in the minutes from the last meeting there had been a number of questions. He asked if “he missed when the answers to those came out”. Cllr Mehta said that the answers had been given by email, and if there was anything else that needed clarification, he would take it back to the next board meeting.

The Clerk said that she’d relayed to councillors some correspondence that had taken place between herself, Angie Astley (Telford & Wrekin Council (TWC)), and Cllr Paul Watling (TWC) regarding questions raised in the last meeting, as well as further questions the Clerk had raised. She’d had responses to some questions, but in the last email sent to Ms Astley there remained a number of unanswered questions, and her subsequent response was to “take them to the board”. Cllr Mehta asked for unanswered questions to be sent to him by the Clerk.

Cllr Parker said that the implication was that Cllr Mehta would be able to give answers. Cllr Mehta said that the first meeting was an introductory meeting. For any more questions, he would take them to next board meeting.

Cllr Parker said that there was a question about if Bournville Village Trust (BVT) was taking the lead and doing all the minutes. He asked the question last time, he said. He added that councillors had been told that the Parish Council would have a “significant say” on how the money was spent, but he did not feel like 1/14<sup>th</sup> was significant.

Cllr Davies said that he thought that the “amount of time spent on this in terms of emails being sent back and forth is quite excessive”. He said that this was not the “Parish Council’s partnership board”, but that it was a board that had been set-up and convened, and they had a representative on the board in the form of the Chairman of the Parish Council. He said that the Parish Council was part of the LPB; the Parish Council was not putting any money towards the LPB, so he thought that “we need to see how it goes”. Cllr Davies said that he hadn’t been at the first meeting, but he knew that a family emergency for the chair of the LPB had “left it curtailed”.

Cllr Davies said that from his perspective, “why does it matter who takes the minutes, surely we’re talking about deliverables, there’s a whole raft of emails back and forth, it doesn’t really give us as a Parish Council the best reputation in terms of partnership working when we’re getting obsessed with processes”. He added “let’s start to get some deliverables”. He continued that he didn’t feel it was the role of the Parish Council to ask the Borough Council about what its processes were. “How the Borough wishes to behave is up to them”, he said. It was up to the Parish Council “to decide how it behaves”. He added, “we should get our sleeves rolled-up and work for the residents”.

The Clerk said that if the minutes from the LPB were being sent out, they should be sent to the Clerk of the Parish Council, adding that “everything goes through the Clerk”. She pointed out that Cllr Mehta had “a day job as well”, and that his job and his work with the Interfaith Council kept him “very busy”, so if he had received the minutes and hadn’t shared them, the Clerk could have done so instead. Cllr Mehta said that he hadn’t received the minutes, and if he had he would have shared them. It was “another thing [he could] chase up”.

Cllr Yorke said that the first draft of the Terms of Reference said the LPB would be made up of 14 representatives, when it in fact had 16 on it, which had since been corrected. What concerned him, Cllr Yorke said, was that of those 16 representatives there were six senior Borough Council who “would appear to have voting rights”. Cllr Yorke said that “in all [his] career, [he] had never sat on a committee when officers have had voting rights”. He added that “officers are there to carry out the will of the elected members”. He did raise it last time, he said, as he found it “personally highly unusual”. He said that “if it’s the way of the world now then so be it” but having only one Parish council representative “worries him”, on the basis that they were talking about £300,000 of money.

In response to Cllr Yorke’s point, Cllr Davies said that there were only two representatives from the Borough Council, highlighting section 2.1 of the document for reference. He pointed out that the Parish Council had the same number of representatives as organisations such as the police, Clinical Commissioning Group, Wrekin Housing Group, the Lawley Village Community association, and Homes England. Given that money was coming from the Borough Council, he said, it was “only right to have an officer and a cabinet member to oversee that”.

Cllr Yorke said that Cllr Davies had “obviously [...] seen something he [hadn’t]”, or that he’d “had a senior moment”.

The Clerk said that regarding the Terms of Reference, having spoken to some other stakeholders who were or would be attending the meeting, they had shared a concern about voting, specifically about their representatives at the meetings being asked to make decisions on behalf of their organisations. In most organisations, the Clerk explained, the timeframe between document sharing and the meeting for them to be discussed and come to a decision on how to vote was not long enough. That was one of the questions that had been asked. Cllr Mehta asked if those stakeholders would raise those concerns at the next meeting; the Clerk said that she had “no idea”.

Cllr Davies said that it was “up to other organisation to speak for themselves at the meeting”. In terms of how the meetings normally worked, he said, it would be rare for there to be a vote, but rather that they would proceed on a consensus basis. If there was a time there was something confidential, Cllr Davies said that he thought Cllr Mehta would ask for a vote to be deferred so that he could confer with the Parish Council. He said that he thought they were “getting bogged down in processes”, and that they needed “to get this vehicle up and running and working for residents”. He said that it was not for the Parish Council to “try and manage the board”, adding that they were “one member of the board, it’s for the Borough Council to crack on with the concerns being raised”.

Cllr Jayne Greenaway said that one time to be careful would be when there were financial implications.

Cllr Mehta said that he would go to the meetings, and that he wouldn’t vote on something like that but rather would “bring it back” to the Parish Council.

Cllr Vidor said that it was similar to what happened with the Lawley Management Committee meetings he attended on behalf of the Parish Council – he said that there were lots of things there that could cause conflicts of interest, so he made it clear if he abstained and was not speaking on behalf of the Parish Council.

Cllr Mehta said that “of course as the chair” he would “be sensible and appropriately deal with it”.

**ACTION: Clerk to send Cllr Mehta any unanswered questions about the Lawley Partnership Board for him to take to the next board meeting. Cllr Mehta to relay the answers back to councillors.**

**ACTION: Cllr Mehta to chase-up the minutes from the last Lawley Partnership Board meeting.**

*c) Parish Council representation*

Cllr Mehta said that at the last meeting, this item had been commented upon, but some councillors weren’t present, so he deferred it. He explained that he had been invited as the Chairman to attend the LPB and he had accepted. He asked if everyone was happy for him to carry on as their representative.

Cllr Davies said that “if they invite the chair, then that’s what the invite is”. He added that if Cllr Mehta were unable to attend, maybe the Vice Chairman could attend on his behalf.

Cllr Mehta said that in the absence of other comments, he would continue to attend as the Parish Council representative. He asked Cllr Yorke if he was happy with Cllr Davies’ suggestion.

Cllr Yorke said that “it’s Murphy’s Law isn’t it”, and asked if a volunteer would be prepared to go if both he and Cllr Mehta were unable to attend.

**2020/160**

**COMMUNICATIONS**

*a) Weekly emails*

The Clerk explained that this item had been deferred from the last meeting due to a lack of members. She said that they had done one test of the concept, which arose following discussions that there had been a “ping-pong” of emails sent to councillors. She said that Matt Lever (Administrative Assistant) had put a collective email together, but no responses had been received, though she assumed members had all received it.

The Clerk said that some things that had come in during the past week warranted being sent out immediately, rather than being left to be collated. If members were happy for important information to be sent out as it arrived, she said, the staff team would continue with a weekly email for more general information.

Cllr Mehta said that he was “happy with that”, and asked members for comments. There were no comments. Cllr Mehta said to continue with the weekly emails.

**ACTION: Weekly email to continue as appropriate. Important or time-critical information to be sent out as it arrives.**

*b) Responses*

The Clerk said that “some people are very, very good at responding in a timely manner, and some people are not”. She asked if when members received an email marked ‘response required’, they would you mind doing it as soon as possible. It was “very frustrating waiting for responses, as other things stack up”, she said.

Cllr Mehta asked members “to take note”.

**ACTION: Councillors to respond in a timely manner to all emails marked as ‘response required’.**

*c) Resumption of face-to-face meetings*

Cllr Mehta said that before he would take questions on this item, he wished to say that he had spoken to the Clerk earlier that day and hadn’t yet shared with councillors that he had lost a cousin the previous day to COVID-19. He was concerned with this issue, he said, and thought it needed more time. He said that he “couldn’t live with his conscience if anything happened to any members or staff”, and that his suggestion was to “try to stick to virtual [meetings]”. He asked members for comments.

Cllr Parker offered his condolences to Cllr Mehta and agreed with his point – he didn’t think they should be exposing people to risks that they didn’t have to. His reading of the information was that the government was saying that they had to go back to face-to-face meetings. The Clerk said yes, explaining to the councillor that the legislation put in place at the start of the pandemic had given 7 May 2021 as an end date. She thought that what was being said among clerks, and parish councils nationally within SALC (Shropshire Association of Local Councils) and NALC (National Association of Local Councils), was that the government had extended its own virtual meeting window to autumn but hadn’t changed legislation for local authorities and parish/town councils. She said that the legislation would expire on 7 May. She pointed out that legally, the Parish Council should – “unless they change their minds” – be looking to have face-to-face meetings.

Cllr Greenaway said that she was sorry to hear Cllr Mehta’s news, and that she agreed with Cllr Parker. She said that “they obviously want us to go back”, but she didn’t think that “there will be a great hurry to do that” across the country. The country was only just coming out of lockdown, she said, but they “really don’t know what’s around the corner, and things might change dramatically in a very short space of time”. She said that the issue was that if they were told to go back, she was “sure that legislation and possibly pressure might change that”. She added that she couldn’t “see the need to risk it at the moment”.

Cllr Davies said that he thought “what the government is doing is bonkers”; he said that they could have amended the Coronavirus Act to “make this go away as an issue”. Unless the government were to pass primary legislation, he said, that was the law. He said that he was aware of other parish and town councils that were bringing forward their AGMs (Annual General Meetings) so that they could hold them virtually before the legislation expired, and he thought that Lawley and Overdale Parish Council should do the same – for that and other pertinent meetings. Unless something changed, he said, the Parish Council was going to need to meet physically and finding a venue for that “would be tricky”. He added that there were not a huge number of committees, so they could hold those at Full Council. He finished by saying “it is real, and we need to plan for it”.

Cllr Mehta said that he agreed with Cllr Davies’ suggestion to hold the AGM earlier. He said that he had a vulnerable mother in the house as well, and “it’s a risk”, asking “do we want to take that risk?”. He said that he wouldn’t want to, but he would go with whatever members decided.

Cllr Parker wondered if any meetings that weren’t held face-to-face after 7 May would be illegal, and whether that would be the case for subcommittee meetings as well. The Clerk said that any virtual meetings held after 7 May would be unlawful. Cllr Parker said they would have to look at the village hall, pointing out that it was a big space, and they would have to do hold meetings there. The Clerk said that the team had discussed that, but the problem with Lawley Community Centre (LCC) was that groups still hadn’t restarted. The Parish Council shouldn’t be seen to be using the LCC, the Clerk said, but should instead be safeguarding nursery users. The Carpenter Centre may not be happy with holding meetings there either, she said, due to the children at the Linden Centre. And if the AGM were brought forward, she added, it may clash with the PCC (Police and Crime Commissioner) elections.

Cllr Davies said that he wasn't suggesting holding a physical AGM, but that he was suggesting that they hold it before 7 May so that it could still be a virtual meeting. He said that he thought they should ask the team to look at options, and that they needed to look at agenda items and work out what was urgent and what wasn't. He said that they should try to hold all meetings that can be held virtually before the cut off, then "use delegations when you can". He thought that there was no point going through every venue now – that the staff team should do that – but they should bring the AGM forward. He said that they could look for a council meeting location that would be appropriate in June.

Cllr Yorke said that he would be "uncomfortable" with face-to-face meetings. Regarding the AGM he thought that papers would have to go out five days beforehand and asked the Clerk if she was "confident that we can meet that sort of forward dating", which he said was only two weeks away. He was "all for a virtual AGM", he said, which he felt was "most sensible", but he was "just looking at logistics as well".

The Clerk said that the paperwork could be done and sent out on time. If they were to hold a meeting the Thursday before, on 6 May, that was the same date as the PCC elections, she said, so she was not sure of members' availability. The paperwork could go out though, she said – the Chairman's annual report might not be ready, but they could note that it would be forthcoming.

Cllr Mehta asked members if they would be available on 6 May.

Cllr Davies said yes, but he didn't think they would need to have a long meeting – "just core items", he said.

Cllr Parker said that he was not available.

Cllr Greenaway said yes, she would be available. She hoped it would be a short meeting, and she would be "OK" for 6pm.

The Clerk pointed out that they normally held an AGM followed by a normal Full Council, so they would "just get business out of the way".

Cllr Vidor said that 6pm was "looking a bit busy"; he asked why they couldn't hold it the week before. Cllr Davies pointed out that the AGM had to take place in May. Cllr Mehta asked if it had to be on a Thursday, and whether could it happen on 4 May instead.

Cllr Parker said that he was busy on 4 May, though he could possibly manage 5:30pm to 6:15pm on 6 May.

Cllr Yorke said that "the book of rules says it has to start at 6pm". The Clerk said that she wasn't sure if that was legislative or not, to which Cllr Yorke answered that it was "in the councillor's guide".

Cllr Mehta said to go for 6 May, as most people would be available except for Cllr Parker.

Cllr Vidor pointed out that they had another meeting planned on 13 May and asked why they couldn't hold the AGM then. The Clerk pointed out that they were moving the AGM forward so that they could still hold it virtually before the legislation expired on 7 May.

After checking, Cllr Yorke said that AGMs may be held "at such time as a parish council decides, but if no hour is fixed it must begin at 6pm", so it did give some flexibility.

Cllr Mehta said to reschedule the AGM to 5:30pm on 6 May 2021. All members agreed.

**ACTION: Lawley and Overdale Parish Council's Annual General Meeting to be rescheduled for 5:30pm on 6 May 2021, to enable it to be held virtually before the relevant legislation expires on 7 May.**

**2020/161**

**PROW (Public Rights of Way) WORKING GROUP**

Jill Holland explained that there was not a great deal to report, so her update would be very brief. The last steering group meeting had been cancelled, as they had yet to receive a response to the questions raised at a previous meeting. Ms Holland explained that she had been chasing that up. She had contacted the Local Access Forum and the Telford Bridleway Association and was looking to meet with them shortly – they were just trying to find a time. The team had started to look at some of the paths, she said, to link them with those on the definitive map, but progress was "very slow".

The Clerk said that there was pertinent information for Cllr Parker regarding LO4 – it still had barbed wire across it, she said. They had received correspondence that day from residents on Long Row Drive, who'd contacted TWC and the Parish Council; they had been informed back in 2018 that a legal order had been sent to the landowner to remove the barbed

wire, but it had “obviously been ignored”, she said. She said that she had chased it numerous times and would chase it again and pass on their comments. She explained to the residents that they were doing an assessment anyway, but that she understood their frustrations.

Cllr Greenaway asked who the landowners were. The Clerk said she believed it to be Parkfield Estates. The Clerk said that she had asked for clarification as to whether the legal notice had actually been served.

The Clerk reminded the Chairman that Cllr Jacqui Seymour had another meeting to attend at 7pm.

Cllr Mehta started the Ward Members session early to accommodate Cllr Seymour.

## **2020/162 WARD MEMBERS SESSION**

- Wrockwardine Ward includes the Travellers’ site at Ketley Brook. Two years ago, she, the Clerk, and the then-Chairman of the Parish Council visited the site at the request of residents, as they were very concerned about the conditions of the wash blocks, drains, and “a whole range of issues”. Primarily, the wash blocks were not insulated, tended to steam up, got wet, were “pretty horrible”, and the drains were blocked. Meetings were then held with TWC officers, who accepted the problems that were there; as a result, they said they would come forward with a scheme to put things right and try to do something to bring site up to the same level as the other Travellers’ site at Lodge Road. The site at Lodge Road was updated by the previous Conservative administration, she said, then again by the current administration, and it is “considerably better” than the Ketley Brook site.

Cllr Seymour explained that eventually a scheme came forward that was “all singing and all dancing”; instead of costing thousands, it would “cost something like £3 million”, and the Parish Council was asked to make a contribution, which it ultimately decided not to do. They assumed work would then be modified accordingly and some work would still carry on, she said. The Parish Council had been approached by residents of the site again, however, and it seemed nothing had been done, and their interpretation was that nothing was going to be done. Officers were “quite offhand about it all”, she said. The councillor had asked for a Teams meeting with officers at some stage to take this matter further, as she felt it “really is unsatisfactory that people should live in those kinds of conditions, when they are not expected to at Lodge Road”.

*Cllr Jacqui Seymour departed the meeting at 18:56.*

**Cllr Shaun Davies** – reported that:

- He had to leave the meeting early due to family commitments.
- A new café had been opened by the owner of the old shop at Dawley Bank. It had “gone down really well with the community”, and they were keen to engage with the Parish Council “about a restaurant and food/eatery offer”. Cllr Davies had asked the owner to contact the Clerk and asked if she had received anything. The Clerk said that she had not received anything. Cllr Davies said that he would chase the owner again.

*Cllr Shaun Davies departed the meeting at 19:02.*

**Cllr Jayne Greenaway** – reported that:

- She had quite a few anti-social behaviour (ASB) items to report, but she saw that ASB was an item further down on the agenda.
- Off-roaders had “wreaked havoc all weekend”. A number of videos had been sent to the Safer Neighbourhoods Team (SNT), and “we really have to identify these [riders]”. She explained that they had been riding around with balaclavas, no helmets, and no plates. The bikes were “quite identifiable”, however, and she felt they were coming from the “bottom end”, probably from Ketley or Overdale. She said that those were the worst offenders, weaving through pedestrians, though there was another group “up towards Dawley Bank and Station Road area”.

There were numerous videos, and she was trying to urge residents to report everything they recorded. She felt that “we’ve really got to get these bikes and crush them, it’s the only thing that’s going to stop them”.

The Clerk said that a resident had contacted Cllr Greenaway that day, who had in turn contacted the Clerk. The resident had sent in five videos, and the groups were differing. The Clerk said that there was the Station Road group, and “the other group was on the Ironbridge Way, Wrekin Way etc”. The Clerk did contact the CAT (Community Action Team) and police, and she had heard back from both just before the meeting. They told her they had been out and walked the whole area, the paths, “up Station Road and the other areas”. Signs, CCTV, and

barriers had been discussed, though the “problem was that the path is massive, and barriers would not assist in preventing entry to the park area”, though there was a possibility of placing a barrier on Stoney Fold. The Clerk said that police had liaised with and given videos to their traffic units of vehicles on the main road, so the CAT team and police were “on it”. The Clerk added that she knew this was an annual occurrence as the weather grew warmer, but because there so much ASB in general it had further compounded the issue for residents.

Cllr Mehta said that he had discussed the issue with the Clerk “the other day”, and that “we are aware of it, we are on top of it”. It was a nuisance, he said, and not fair for the residents, as well as being unsafe for the people on their bikes too.

Cllr Greenaway asked that her own feelings towards the people on the bikes not be recorded in the minutes. She added that it was “difficult to get people out on 101”, but that if you emailed the SNT while they were not on duty, they didn’t pick it up, making it difficult to “get someone out when they’re there”. She asked when the CAT team were on duty, and if they were flexible.

The Clerk said that they were flexible and could operate on evenings and weekends depending on the issues in the area. She added that there was a dedicated CAT email address, and that she sent everything to that and the SNT. Early indications were that they were working very well together, the Clerk said, and were “all on the same page”. Cllr Mehta asked the Clerk to share the CAT email address.

**2020/163**

**PARISH COUNCILLORS SESSION**

**Cllr John Yorke** – reported that:

- Regarding Phase 11, it had been brought to his attention that even more documents had been added to the planning application on 23 March, mostly to do with storm and water calculations. Cllr Yorke explained that he was “not a storm water expert”, but it worried him that it appeared to show the drainage pipes were going to be surging, which he said meant they would be at capacity, and that there were quite a few occasions of anticipated flooding. This worried the councillor, as they “already have flooding issues”. He said that he was trying to get hold of an old colleague who knew more about the subject, to “see if it’s as bad as it looks”.

Cllr Yorke was worried they kept “adding little bits”, and that it was down to the Parish Council to keep checking.

The Clerk agreed with Cllr Yorke and said that it was “very frustrating” that there was no duty for parish councils or objectors to be notified of new documents on the portal. She said that she had raised the issue several times before but had been told “we’d be there every five minutes emailing you” – the Clerk said that she would be fine with that, but it wasn’t going to happen. She added that while speaking to developers that morning on another matter, she had been told that the drainage officer at TWC had agreed to the scheme, “but kept saying ‘I want this, I want this’”, which she felt was likely the reason for all the additions. She said that she would “push for ‘when’s it going to be heard then’”.

**Cllr Lee Vidor** – reported that:

- One thing that had been “crossing his plate a lot” over the last couple of months was that there had been a lot of accidents, car accidents, and collisions, which he saw a lot of due to his involvement in Speedwatch and the partnerships arising from that. He said that there had been “some really serious accidents happening” of which he thought the Council needed to be aware.

He said he remembered speaking to Highways a few months previously; they were gathering data on Lawley Drive and West Centre Way to set up lights and were going to feedback data on how things were supposed to work. He thought it would be good to have discussions with both Highways and police teams, and that maybe there were “some simple things we can do to promote safe use of roads”. He added that it was “really quite scary when you hear what’s happening” and said that there were “a lot of things going on, and the Parish [Council] needs to know is happening”.

Cllr Mehta asked the Clerk to put the issue on the next meeting agenda, and to “do an email to Highways”.

Cllr Vidor continued, and said that a major incident had happened on Dawley Road, and the front of a house had been “taken out” in Arleston. He said that it was a huge issue, “but we have to start somewhere”.



Cllr Greenaway said that several times they had been promised a review when the traffic lights were all switched off. She said that there were specific areas that caused issues for residents, such as the main lights and the Birchfield lights. Cllr Mehta asked the Clerk to “chase that up”.

The Clerk said that before the pandemic the Parish Council had quarterly Highway’s liaison meetings, but they had dropped off. She thought that “officers are buried in their burrows somewhere”, as she received very little correspondence from them. She suggested they arrange a Teams meeting and invite councillors to be there.

Cllr Yorke said that in November 2011, the Parish Council had approved a report on the traffic light systems. Adam Brookes (TWC) had “sat at a meeting in the Parish Council offices and said there were cheap quick win-win systems here”. He said that Birchfield Way was not designed in-line with current standards regarding safety periods between phases, which was why there were collisions. “Sweet nothing has been done on this report at all”, he said, and he felt it was “like banging your head against a brick wall”.

Because of social media, Cllr Yorke continued, he had started talking about Lawley Drive, where speed tended to be the main problem, and he had started making enquiries about the cost of speed cameras. He had contacted a company to whom he had sent a Google Map for a quote and added that if nothing came from the Borough Council, perhaps they could get something from the Lawley Partnership Board. He said that they had a meeting with Adam Brookes in November, when Lawley Drive speed cameras were discussed, and Mr Brookes had said he “may have a few bob left in the account”.

“At the end of the day”, Cllr Yorke said, “we can laugh, jest, and get annoyed about it, we have a duty to the public, we now have an opportunity, and if the Parish Council is happy [he] can pursue it”. He added that if those systems were coordinated, it “could go a long way”.

The Clerk said that traffic calming measures on Lawley Drive were mentioned in the Pride in the Community scheme, but it didn’t say what they were. She said that when she contacted them, she would ask that question.

**ACTION: Clerk to email Highways to arrange a meeting.**

**ACTION: Clerk to chase-up the previously promised traffic lights review.**

**ACTION: Clerk to arrange a Highways liaison meeting and invite councillors to attend.**

**Cllr Rob Parker** – reported that:

- He wanted to second the conversations about traffic problems. One thing he had noticed, he said, was that “we’ve got bridges in the centre of the village, towards Horsehay they’re very difficult to get across”. He said that people had to “wait a lot of time”, and with more houses up there, “there needs to be something much safer”. He suggested that “maybe we should have islands and underpasses and such”.

**2020/164**

**COMMUNITY AFFAIRS**

*a) Carpenter/Linden Centre/Overdale lights*

The Clerk said that notes of the Carpenter Centre had been sent out in the first weekly email, and that Ms Holland had tried to contact the Linden Centre headteacher to speak to him separately. Cllr Eileen Callear, as Ward member, had made contact with the cabinet member for education to see whether there were extension plans for the Linden Centre to move into the main body of the Carpenter Centre. At the moment, she said, there seemed to be discussions but no concrete plans, which was “no use to us for community use”. She said they had another meeting planned in a few weeks’ time, so “hopefully we will have something back from the headteacher, and also know a little more”.

She said that the Borough regeneration money promised back in 2019 – a “million-pound pot” to be shared with areas in need, which included Overdale – was also raised at the Carpenter Centre meeting, and she had asked Cllr Callear to pursue the fund.

Regarding Christmas lights, the Clerk said the only place likely to be suitable was in front of the Carpenter Centre. The headteacher of the Linden Centre told her that they had tried to use the socket last year, but it appeared to be broken. The Clerk said that “we knew it was broken, because your little poppets kicked seven bells out of it”. She had asked him if he would like the Parish Council to look at it again, as it would be cheaper than getting a supply from a lamp post.

b) *CAT update*

The Clerk explained that the CAT team, consisting of nine officers, had started work. She said that they “could have one [officer] on the patch, or nine on the patch”, though the average was three officers, because of the escalation in ASB and bikes. “All seemed to be working very well”, she said, and “in harmony with the police”. She told councillors that CAT officers were available over a seven-day period with ‘flexi-times’. She added that while they were paying for five days if there were issues Paul Fenn (TWC) could deploy them on a Saturday if required. Early indications were that it was working, she said.

The Clerk then said that she had attended an interview to appoint someone to the Liaison Officer position; they had made an appointment pending references, and although she couldn’t say who it was at that time, she said that the person was known to the Parish Council, and she thought that they were going to work “very well” together.

Cllr Vidor asked regarding the enforcement scheme they had bought into, which covered different areas such as dog fouling, parking, etc, were they in any way logging or making a list of areas they would want them to go to on a regular basis, to “maybe get feedback from them about what they can and can’t do”. He said that he sometimes sees cars mounted on the pavement and wanted to start looking at those things.

The Clerk said that they had reported a car that was “doing exactly that”. They had been alerted by a resident and passed it on to the CAT email address. Paul Fenn then contacted the police “and said ‘this is one for you guys’”. They couldn’t issue a penalty, she said, but they could issue a notice. The police had shared their logo which goes on the penalty notice, she said, so the resident would see it and it would look like a police notice.

Cllr Vidor said that it was “great to have a warning”, which was “better than nothing”. He thought using those warnings would be a “great start”.

Cllr Greenaway said that she had a similar question about enforcement and what the CAT’s actual powers were. She asked what the process would be for a Ward councillor to report incidents, and whether it would be quicker to go through the Clerk.

The Clerk said that she needed to establish whether the CAT email address could be shared with councillors, rather than reports coming through the Clerk. She clarified that she had no problem with reports being sent to her or the team, and they would be happy to pass them on. She said that they hadn’t yet had their first catch-up meeting with the CAT team and the police; at that point they would get a data report about enforcement issues, and how many warning notices had been issued.

Cllr Greenaway asked the Clerk if it would be alright for her to send a complaint about a sensitive topic via the Clerk, as she would rather not share it in Full Council. The Clerk said yes.

Cllr Mehta reminded councillors that he would have to leave in 20 minutes and asked if they “could just keep comments to the point”.

**ACTION: Clerk to find out whether it is possible to share the CAT email address with councillors.**

c) *ASB reported RE Lawley Village Green MUGA/Shelter*

The Clerk said that most members were aware of the escalation in bad behaviour in the parish. She said that it was not one particular group, and there seemed to be “a couple of groups operating”, ranging from younger age groups up to 17 – 23 year olds. They were mixing together, she said, and “getting smashed out their heads”, leaving vodka bottles smashed all over the ball court, nitrous oxide canisters lying around, and they “actually set a fire in the shelter at the weekend”. All this was reported and well-documented, she said, with photos from residents and their PET operative. The Clerk offered “many thanks” to Simon Bailey and his wife, and Cllr Greenaway, for doing a “major litter-pick” the previous Sunday morning. She also offered her thanks to the Street Champions, including “Heather and co. from the village”. They shouldn’t have to be doing this, she said.

She said that police were doing patrols, adding that their PET operative had seen them out a number of times, as well as CAT enforcement officers. It was very difficult, she said, adding that “girls are in there among that, who are spitting on vehicles, causing criminal damage to vehicles”. She also highlighted that the Community Garden had suffered damage, as the bird table had been knocked down and the daffodil heads knocked off. The Community Garden had never been targeted before, but they were now using it “to cut through to Tom Morgan/Bartholomew.”

She said that they had been asked about the Lawley Village Green shelter by residents a few times, and “everybody in the [ASB] survey wanted the shelter out”, and she rhetorically asked why it was still there. She had raised the matter with both

the police and the Borough; she thought she spoke for everyone at the Parish Council when she said they supported having the shelter removed, or at least taking off the top. She said that Paul Fenn would also support removing it; only the voice of one officer at the Borough was holding it up. She said that it was going to be an item for discussion at the next CAT meeting.

Cllr Mehta said that they needed a follow-up and comments from members. He advised the Clerk to tell them that it had been mentioned at the Full Council meeting as well. It “definitely needs to be dealt with and addressed”, he said.

Cllr Yorke said that this highlighted that the ongoing discussions about the MUGA (Multi-Use Games Area) at Gresham Drive were justified, as recent events had shown the issues they could cause.

The Clerk said that the administrators of the Lawley Village Community Facebook group had been working closely with the Parish Council. She said that after the ASB that occurred over the previous weekend, the group’s administrators had “had a glut of people trying to join” the group, and that one of them had “started stirring it up with residents”. The feeling was that this was “obviously one of the groups involved in ASB”. All have been blocked.

Cllr Vidor said that he supported the removal of the shelter, adding that he knew it was only “one person blocking it”. He thought they should get over that hurdle. He asked if CCTV was provided as part of the CAT scheme.

The Clerk said that CCTV would “ideally” be there, but there was no power that far across, and it would cost thousands of pounds to lay cabling. She had spoken to Paul Fenn about covert cameras, but they would have to put a notice up to say there was monitoring in the area, which would prompt the people being monitored to “go looking for covert cameras, rip them off, and smash them”.

The Clerk said that due to the issues in the Community Garden, they would need to be “mindful” of any expenditure while looking to enhance it. She said that they were looking to place the Wrekin Way camera in the community garden, “for just a week or so”. She thought she could also ask Paul Fenn if he had a spare camera that could go there.

**ACTION: Clerk to investigate installing a camera in the Community Garden.**

**2020/166                      CORRESPONDENCE**

The Clerk said that they had asked about a lease for the Community Garden instead of a licence, and she had received a reply from James Dunn (TWC) that afternoon. He informed the Clerk that he had chased the Estates team to get terms on a lease, but because the site was already designated Green Guarantee site, it would need formal cabinet approval, which would likely occur in July – at which time he could complete the lease

***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***

**2020/167                      CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS**

Items were noted.

**2020/168                      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

**2020/169                      DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

It was **NOTED** that the **FULL COUNCIL** parish meeting would take place on **THURSDAY 6<sup>th</sup> MAY 2021 at 5:30pm. Due to the uncertainties created by COVID-19, the venue is likely to be virtual.**

The meeting closed at 19:37.

Signed..... Chair

Date.....

**ACTION RECORD**

<b>Minute no.</b>	<b>Open date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Assigned to</b>	<b>Target date</b>	<b>Date closed</b>	<b>Comments</b>
2020/158	15/04/2021	Councillors to approve invoices for payment before Cllr Parker authorises them at the bank.	All councillors	Ongoing	N/A	
2020/158	15/04/2021	Clerk to reschedule the finance committee meeting for 3:30pm on 29 April 2021.	SG	29/04/2021		
2020/159	15/04/2021	Clerk to send Cllr Mehta any unanswered questions about the Lawley Partnership Board for him to take to the next board meeting. Cllr Mehta to relay the answers back to councillors.	SG, RM	06/05/2021		
2020/159	15/04/2021	Cllr Mehta to chase-up the minutes from the last Lawley Partnership Board meeting.	RM	06/05/2021		
2020/160	15/04/2021	Weekly email to continue as appropriate. Important or time-critical information to be sent out as it arrives.	ML, staff	Ongoing	N/A	
2020/160	15/04/2021	Councillors to respond in a timely manner to all emails marked as 'response required'.	All councillors	Ongoing	N/A	
2020/160	15/04/2021	Lawley and Overdale Parish Council's Annual General Meeting to be rescheduled for 5:30pm on 6 May 2021, to enable it to be held virtually before the relevant legislation expires on 7 May.	SG	30/04/2021		
2020/163	15/04/2021	Clerk to email Highways to arrange a meeting.	SG	06/05/2021		
2020/163	15/04/2021	Clerk to chase-up the previously promised traffic lights review.	SG	06/05/2021		
2020/163	15/04/2021	Clerk to re-arrange the Highways liaison meetings and invite councillors to attend.	SG	06/05/2021		
2020/164	15/04/2021	Clerk to find out whether it is possible to share the CAT email address with councillors.	SG	06/05/2021		
2020/164	15/04/2021	Clerk to investigate installing a CCTV camera in the Community Garden.	SG	06/05/2021		

**n.b. "Target date" defaults to the date of the next Full Council meeting when no specific timeframe is set, to enable progress to be reviewed.**