



16 December Full Council meeting minutes

Minutes from 16 December 2021 meeting held at **The Carpenter Centre, Overdale, Telford TF3 5BT.**

In attendance

Members

- Cllr Jayne Greenaway (Central Ward)
- Cllr Rob Parker (West Ward)
- Cllr Cathy Salter (Lawley Ward)
- Cllr John Yorke (Dawley Bank Ward) - Chairman

Clerk (virtual)

- Sharon George

Staff (virtual)

- Jill Holland (Deputy Clerk)
- Matt Lever (Administration Assistant)

2021/094 – Chair's welcome

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting at 18:14 and thanked everybody for attending during such extenuating circumstances. It was noted that as per the recommendation of the National Association of Local Councils, while councillors were attending the meeting physically as required by legislation, staff were attending the meeting virtually as per SLCC/NALC guidance.

Due to the circumstances, Cllr John Yorke asked if agenda items 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 (b, c, d, e, f, g, 10a remains), 11, 12 (bullets 1 and 2, three to remain), 13 and 14 could be deferred until the January meeting. The Clerk asked if she could share a letter under correspondence for a decision, under item 11. Cllr Rob Parker said that he was not happy to defer item 6. All councillors agreed.

2021/095 - Apologies and absences

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.

Apologies received and accepted from:

- Cllr Shaun Davies (Central Ward) – Borough Council commitments
- Cllr Amrik Jhawar (Central Ward) – COVID isolation
- Cllr Raj Mehta (Lawley Ward) – Personal commitments
- Cllr Lee Vidor (Central Ward) – Personal commitments

Departures:



2021/096 – Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

2021/097 – Public participation

There were no members of the public present.

2021/098 – Minutes of the last meeting

The minutes from the **Full Council Meeting** held on **11 November 2021** were **APPROVED**. It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes be signed and **ADOPTED** as a true record. This was **PROPOSED** by Cllr Cathy Salter and **SECONDED** by Cllr Jayne Greenaway.

2021/099 – Finance

2021/099/A – Invoices for payment

Cllr Parker asked if members were happy. The Clerk pointed out that there was an erroneous £10 invoice that should not have been authorised. The Clerk also pointed out that when it came to authorisation, it would be down to Cllr Parker and Cllr Jayne Greenaway, as Cllr Lee Vidor would be unavailable to do so. All members were happy.

2021/071/B – Bank reconciliations

Approved.

2021/100 – Community affairs

2021/100/A – Development plan

Cllr Yorke said that he was “just looking for ideas, figures, whatever we want to call them” from members, so that the Clerk could begin putting together a budget for the next year. He asked members for comments.

Regarding the Community Centre issue, Cllr Yorke asked the Clerk from where the £17,000 figure had come. Cllr Parker pointed out that they were approving the development plan, not the budget, and they did not have to approve the figures at that time.

Cllr Yorke asked members for comments on page one.

Cllr Greenaway said they were going to struggle to put something in there. Cllr Parker said that the way he saw it, they had decided what their priorities were, now they needed to decide what they could afford to do, after asking parishioners.

Cllr Yorke asked if there are any other comments. Cllr Parker highlighted that in the comment’s column, his name was mentioned a lot, and he was “rather uncomfortable with that”. Either all councillor’s thought things were priorities, or they didn’t, he said, but he was uncomfortable approving the plan with his name “all over it”. If the rest of the Council didn’t want something, “let’s not do it” he said.



The Clerk said that if he was uncomfortable his name could be taken off, but she could only see his name once. Cllr Parker then listed several instances of his name being mentioned. The Clerk said that those were taken from the notes from the meeting, and were his priorities, but they could take his name off them.

Cllr Greenaway said that it should read as “members” or “Council” rather than identifying one member.

Cllr Yorke said that the Community Centre was the “number one priority for the Council”.

Everybody was happy with item 1a other than removing Cllr Parker’s name and replacing it with ‘Council’.

The Clerk said they needed a standalone meeting to discuss this, as they needed to “give it more status than we do”, but they were waiting until the ground investigation works were completed to inform the planning process. For now, she thought that just the working group should have a standalone meeting to “thrash out the next stage if everything is fine”, which would be to go through the planning process and look at the electorate. If members were happy at that juncture, she said, they would then have a standalone meeting once things had progressed further.

Ground investigation works were due to start in the second week of January, the Clerk continued, as per the correct drain plans – after the incorrect ones had been posted on the planning portal – had been obtained. The pitches were clear of anything, so they had “got the thumbs-up to start drilling in the new year”.

Cllr Greenaway wondered how they would respond to people seeing a drilling machine in January. The Clerk said that they could make a decision to tell the public, “But we could be pre-empting a riot”, but noted that they didn’t have an answer as they didn’t know what the groundworks would show. So, she said, they “could say they are doing monitoring works”, or, she said, “we could be truthful” but take a risk.

Cllr Parker suggested that if anybody asked, they could say they were investigating land earmarked for future development.

Cllr Yorke again asked if everybody was happy with item 1a. Everybody remained happy.

Councillors then discussed the next item. Cllr Parker reiterated his thought that the objectives needed to be more specific. The Clerk re-iterated that the objectives stated were those of the Councillors, so it was down to them to add the detail.

Cllr Yorke asked the Clerk to update members on the latest news regarding the availability of the Carpenter Centre and, more importantly, the hourly cost and welcoming the public. He knew there were “a few hiccups last Saturday”.

The Clerk said that they met with Simon Hayden, lead on Safer Stronger Communities for Overdale, who was looking to launch at the Carpenter Centre in February/March 2022. She said they were due to have another meeting with him tomorrow. He met with Felicity Mercer and Darren Lennon, headteacher at the Linden Centre, that Tuesday, and was “very keen to update us before Christmas as to how that meeting went”. Simon Hayden had the same enthusiasm and appetite as the Parish Council did, she said, and it was “very fair to say, we’ve been honest with him and said great, welcome to the team, however it’s the higher-ups that make the decisions, and we don’t know what their plans are regarding education”.

The Clerk continued, saying various comments had made about moving forward, and Felicity Mercer did promise there was £3000 available, which Simon Hayden was going to see how that was going to be “drawn down, utilised, were there any things attached to it, et cetera, so hopefully we’ll have an update on that tomorrow”. The Clerk said that she knew from speaking to the headteacher that he’s personally “keen to get involved”, but “we know from



our usage on Saturday that where [Santa's grotto was sited] is kitted out as a one-to-one classroom". That room was deemed to be part of the community space, she said, but already there was no access to that front office. The storeroom was for the Linden Centre, and the back room had also been taken over by the Linden Centre, "so actually all you've got is [the main hall of the Carpenter Centre] you're sitting in", she added.

The Clerk continued, saying that when the Christmas event in the Carpenter Centre failed to have refreshments, the staff went "hunting around the kitchen" to see if there was anything they could use, but the kitchen was "stripped bare", so "it's not a community kitchen anymore". She said that they did notice there were two cupboards still marked with 'Overdale over-60s', and all the group's bingo equipment was still in there, but she knew that group no longer operated, so she was questioning what was happening.

The Clerk said it would be "interesting to see what Telford & Wrekin Council (TWC) said at [the Safer, Stronger Communities] launch, and we've asked about a monetary sum from Safer, Stronger, which was not forthcoming, there's not an actual figure, it's not equally divided across 12 wards, it's all unknown quantities". The Parish Council's main objective was to get community use and groups back in the Carpenter Centre, she said, but "it's how we do that". The Clerk continued by saying "the undertones coming from the education side of TWC are that they will be looking for partnership working funding, or 'why don't we take it back over', and I don't think that's an option given costs were circa £40,000 in 2016/17". The Clerk said that they just needed to "spearhead the charge to get community use in whatever form, whether we use the £3,000 already offered, or we can offer grants to groups, but of course under our grants policy they've got to be properly constituted groups, which a lot in Overdale won't be. There's an awful lot of work to be done, and the focus for the parish has been we need to get that back into use".

The Clerk added that she had spoken to the caretaker at the Carpenter Centre, who was "constantly getting told-off for referring to it as the Carpenter Centre when it's not, it's the Linden Centre".

Cllr Greenaway said that she was "a bit annoyed over that kitchen". If it's a community centre, she said, "that needs putting back". The Clerk said that a lot of work needed to be done on it. Cllr Greenaway said that TWC was responsible for doing that, and they couldn't have a community centre without that. That would be a big question for them, she said – "if they want the community to use it, they've got to put the facilities back in".

Cllr Parker said that the Parish Council had to either decide whether that was something in which it needed to invest, or if they want to decide to do something else.

Cllr Yorke asked how much money would be needed "to get it up and running, and how much to tick over". He added that he was "annoyed", as the Parish Council had put a lot of money into putting on a Christmas event there, "and there was no footfall". He estimated that he had "14 children in three hours, and that grotto cost us £290". He continued, "is it a fact that they're saying they're interested, but do we have to come to you? We have to take a measured view – you said you wanted this, then we put something on, they didn't have to pay for anything, and it does make you wonder was it worth it, is it worth it". He said they kept reminding Bournville Village Trust (BVT) that Overdale was "a part of the parish, don't forget them, so we have a duty", but "you do feel like you're banging your head against a brick wall, and it gets sore after a while". He said that it came "down to what we as a Full Council feel – do we give it a bit of a push with a low-cost event, and see how it pans out", adding that "though personally I'm very concerned about all the promises going on".

Cllr Greenaway said that it had been discussed with residents and found "it'd be lovely to have more events like this" but wondered "are they really bothered". She said the "old folks" would like to have a coffee morning, and she felt that it would be beneficial for the Parish Council to support a number of community events. She added that



she was continuing the discussions, “but when we’re looking at something in Lawley like the Christmas fayre, look at something in Overdale as a one-off thing, then perhaps summer can be another thing, and still continue the discussions at this point”.

Cllr Parker said that two of his children used to use the Carpenter Centre, and “that’s exactly what it’s for”.

Cllr Yorke said that he was “putting something to the council – are we working on the basis that we are doing low-key events without actually making a commitment to regularise the whole issue of supporting clubs left right and centre?” He added that “perhaps one event at Christmas for users is unfair to gauge, but staff, equipment, etc is expensive”. He asked whether members wished for the item to stay in.

Cllr Greenaway thought they should keep up discussions and emphasise the need for community use and use the Parish Council to facilitate those events. She thought that “perhaps we could use the funding to put towards the hire of the building when we want to front something”.

The Clerk said that it would stay in as part of the development plan to facilitate community use, but that it would “be interesting from our perspective to see what Safer, Stronger has on offer to work with us on this”. She said that they couldn’t “have been more forceful regarding ‘we want that usage back’ than we have last few years”. She thought that they should still build that in, and still work with TWC to facilitate, adding “that’s what it’s about”. Regarding events, the Clerk pointed out that events came under another item on the development plan anyway.

Cllr Yorke raised the next item on the development plan – **expanding the provision of Christmas lights**. He said that the Lawley Partnership Board (LPB) and the Lawley Village Community Association (LVCA) were critical. He thought that Lawley could be better lit at Christmas and asked what the Parish Council would like to do about it. He pointed out that he had already suggested to the LVCA that they could look at a partnership.

Cllr Greenaway pointed out that “physically, they can’t go anywhere else”. She said that “it’d be lovely to have them all lit up, you’d think it would be Lawley Square, but Kerry [Woodhouse, TWC] might be able to negotiate something. If you can get the lights to stay on the façades, good luck – they’ll fall off”.

The Clerk said that she’d had a meeting with Kerry Woodhouse the previous week, at which Ms Woodhouse had promised they were going to “work together, and that was our objective for expanding them next year”. She said there was a “glimmer of hope” that Morrisons had new landlords, and a better relationship with them. Kerry Woodhouse “doesn’t understand the logistics”, she said, adding that there was an “awful lot of work to do”. She pointed out that a comment had been made on social media, while promoting the Overdale Christmas fayre - “Overdadians didn’t come and say, ‘this is great see you there’, they asked why we couldn’t have lights in Overdale”. She said that they did look at putting lights up in Overdale this year, but the location is a bus route, so the lights must be at a certain height. She added that they could only attach them to certain columns, residents would have to agree, and “if we want to do it, it’s not cheap”.

The Clerk continued, saying that the “embarrassment” of the Lawley lights cost £5,000, then storage and maintenance costs. Whatever they did, she said, would represent an ongoing, annual cost. It wouldn’t just be Overdale and Lawley either, she said, and “that’s what was very concerning with the LPB promoting Lawley, Lawley, Lawley”. As the Parish Council, she said, they had to be careful that they were not promoting Lawley and nowhere else in the parish. She added that they were happy to expand the provision, and if the budget was there “we’ll do the legwork” but pointed out that they had to be “mindful”.

Cllr Parker reiterated that they needed to be more specific, such as “some lights for Overdale, more lights for Lawley”. He pointed out that they “spent two hours doing this development plan – did we not have these



discussions then?" Cllr Yorke said that the Overdallians had said that they wanted some lights, to which Cllr Parker said that "wasn't unreasonable". Cllr Yorke said that he thought it was interesting that was what the Overdallians said, "almost, thanks for the Christmas fayre, we're not interested." Cllr Parker said, "so our residents want lights in Overdale", and reiterated that should be a specific target for the plan.

Cllr Yorke moved the discussion on to the **environment** portion of the development plan, to the item that required them to increase the value for money of the Community Action Team (CAT) scheme. It was about making sure the councillors, not just the staff, got highly involved in identifying concerns and issues, he said. He said that they received reports back "that it's working A-OK", but "is it working A-OK to £67,000 a year, in comparison to what [the Parish Environmental Team (PET) operative] does"?

Cllr Parker said "this is the same sort of thing. Increase value for money, great. What value for money are we getting now? We had reports a few months ago, they were useless, pointless".

Cllr Cathy Salter asked if they could ask the CAT to give the Parish Council timed reports throughout the year. Cllr Parker said that was part of the contract, and "if they're not providing it, we need to cancel the contract. Hold them to account".

The Clerk said that she was not defending them at all, and that with this scheme there were two elements – the PET, and the CAT. The PET, as the Parish Council had it before, was "very much a known quantity, we know what we're getting, and can see the value added", she said. The Clerk pointed out that although she was initially opposed to a liaison officer, she now thought it was worth the money for the 15.5 hours he does on the patch. The enforcement element was "a lot more difficult to measure, as it's not as visible for councillors". She pointed out that she received around 20 photos and comments a day from the enforcement officers, and although she was not going to share every 'this road is clear' or 'eight tickets issued' message, she did get a lot of information from them. When that's translated into a report, she said, it didn't really show a lot.

The Clerk said that she knew people were "on the ground, out there, patrolling for dog poo, whatever they're supposed to do", but it was "difficult to show added value". She thought that once Birchfield Way was adopted and the issues with parking down there were addressed, "hopefully we might see a little bit more", and although she knew that was only one area of the parish, it was a focus area for a number of reasons.

Continuing, the Clerk rhetorically asked, "are we getting value for money?", to which she thought the answer was "for me definitely on the PET, the jury is still out on the CAT". She said that she was working with them to get more information and putting ideas forward as a team along with whatever comes in from residents, but she thought that "equally, as councillors you are the eyes and ears on the patch, we all need to play a part to make it a success". She added "you tell me – what do you want them to do, what do you want to see as value added, and we'll put it to Paul Fenn and his team. It's a two-way dialogue, I think that's down to you".

She finished by saying that while the issue was part of the development plan, it was "a work in progress", and she felt it needed "involvement from every member, not just the staff". Hopefully by doing that, she said, "we will get a better service".

Cllr Greenaway said that it might help if they knew who the enforcement officers were. The Clerk pointed out that they were offered a 'meet and greet', but it never happened due to COVID-19.

Jill Holland said that they had raised the issue about knowing who the enforcement officers were in the past, but it had been highlighted that it was a group of officers that covered the whole of the borough. The CAT tried to "mix them up a bit" to avoid creating "familiarity between residents". It had been reviewed in other parts of the country,



and it had been found that people waiting outside schools would get to know the enforcement officers and become friendly with them. “The next thing you know parents would get a ticket on their car, and there have been incidents when parents get abusive and police have to be called”, she said. Paul Fenn had explained to her that as it was not the same officers used all the time, it would be hard to have their names.

Cllr Greenaway suggested that when enforcement officers were working in an area, they needed to know who the parish councillors were. She said she had been talking to one on Birchfield Way, and the officer knew where the office was, but “hadn’t got a clue who the councillors were”. She added “that cuts both ways doesn’t it. We can’t be there all the time, but we need to see what they’re doing”.

Cllr Yorke said that members weren’t 100% happy and thought that presumably they had the ability to terminate the contract if it didn’t get better. He suggested that they “pre-warn the contractor we have concerns regarding their performance, and really put a veiled threat out there”. He added that “everybody remembers the negatives and forgets the positives”. He suggested that they leave the item in the development plan but highlighted that at the last few meetings members had expressed they should do better. He said that “we don’t know all the facts, but the facts we do see are out of date”. The Clerk said that Councillors needed to be more specific as to their expectations and to be more involved in developing the CAT for the Parish area.

Cllr Yorke moved on to the next development plan item, regarding **making use of various green areas**.

The Clerk said that Cllrs Greenaway and Parker would remember when the Parish Council had looked at approximately 16 areas across the parish, and decided on the community garden, and the land at Old Park. Some of those they had looked at originally had been incorporated into open green spaces by the Borough anyway, she said. She said that there were others they could investigate, and by doing so, if TWC ran the Green Guarantee scheme, the Parish Council could put some forward. If TWC didn’t run the scheme, members would have to decide whether or not the Parish Council wanted to investigate the possibility of a lease or licence on further land. She said that while the licence or lease is free, any maintenance would become the Parish Council’s responsibility.

The Clerk added that the team was “more than happy” to identify potential sites, either for TWC’s Green Guarantee, or to look at – and get costings for – ongoing maintenance to put together a package for the Council to consider.

One item, the Clerk said, was to work with volunteers. She said that she had received enquiries from Old Park and Lawley regarding volunteering, but that was something that had been obstructed by COVID-19. If things were better next year, she said, the team could start to get a list of potential volunteers. The PET operative and the community liaison officer were on-board to work with them on the horticultural side of things, she said.

Regarding working with Shropshire Wildlife Trust and nest box workshops, the Clerk said that was something they could investigate, and they were currently free, so they could be done in an outside space like the community garden. These were more specific targets that the staff were happy to undertake, but the Clerk felt the ‘dog waste’ target, while a fantastic idea, would raise logistical issues and planning permission issues. She said they were happy to investigate for councillors, however.

Cllr Greenaway said that the dog waste target was her idea. She would be happy to remove it as there were “bigger things on the table”, but she also thought it should remain there, and they should wait to see if the Green Guarantee comes forward. She thought they certainly needed to do more with the volunteer aspect.

The Clerk said that if the dog waste things go forward through either the LPB or BVT, that might be something that could work together, pointing out that if they had planning permission for bins, they could also site dispensers next to them. It could stay on there, she said, but not be a priority target.



Cllr Yorke moved on to the **public rights of way** (PROW target). He said that as Parish Council, he personally felt that it was important to make sure “TWC don’t do a dirty on us via the definitive plan” but felt that was a very simplistic view.

Cllr Parker said they could see that there was 5 and 12, so that would mean there were “17 we need to get sorted, so that’s our target”. Cllr Greenaway added that “the main target was to get those DMMO applications in, and it doesn’t matter when they’re in, so long as they were in on time”.

Jill Holland said she did forward on the first DMMO from Andrew Careless earlier, which was about PROW L2. Cllr Yorke thanked her.

Cllr Yorke moved on to **parish-wide litter picks**, and listed councillor involvement, Street Champions, contractors, and schools, adding that “the biggest thing is if we’re going to do something like this, we’ve got to provide some equipment”.

Councillors were happy.

Cllr Yorke moved on to 4D, saying there was “nothing too adverse”. There were no comments.

Cllr Yorke moved on to **events**, adding that they’d touched on that “10 hours ago”. Cllr Parker said that he felt it was “a little vague”, and he didn’t know what they were doing. He said that they had done a few events, and asked if they were going to continue them, or if they were looking do a certain number each year in each area. He thought the staff team needed a clear direction from councillors as to what they thought was important, and he didn’t think the item in the development plan offered that.

Cllr Yorke said that was why he had previously mentioned the Overdale event that took place on the prior Saturday. He thought the Christmas fayre “would have been a roaring success, but regrettably it wasn’t”. He suggested that the following Saturday, the date of the Lawley Christmas fayre, would be “the best guide” as to how people felt and what they wanted, wondering if “it might depend on area”. He said that they needed to define something.

The Clerk said that it was not the staff team’s job to decide what events councillors wanted, but they would action whatever they could under the councillors’ direction. Planning for Summerfest was already “well advanced”, and they had already started planning for next Christmas, as well as the Queen’s Jubilee, for which she thought they could do something in Overdale due to the date’s proximity to Summerfest. She said that the Overdale Christmas Fayre “wasn’t a big success” but pointed out that COVID-19 was still an issue and people were cautious, or that maybe they had just got the date or time wrong. She didn’t think they should “just give up and throw our arms up”, and that they should give Overdale another chance. She said that it was about what councillors wanted to do. She asked if they wanted to do more events, and how active they wanted the staff to be. She added that whatever they wanted the staff to, the staff would take on board, but the money had got to be there.

Cllr Yorke asked members what else they needed. He suggested they might need something to tie in with public holidays, such as an Easter parade, a pancake race, “or something like that”. He supposed that it was a case of rather than doing tried and tested ones, “what new ones do we have in mind to make the electorate say, ‘hey this is something different’”.

Cllr Salter suggested that they could do an easter bonnet. Cllr Yorke said that he was trying to think of a larger event.

Cllr Parker reiterated that the point as it stood wasn’t helpful. He suggested that while they were doing a lot of events, they might look for a gap, either in terms of the dates or locations. He went on to say that they may have



reasonable coverage, but they had a relatively lower budget for activities, so maybe they didn't need the point in the plan. He said that maybe they didn't need to do anything new, but maybe they needed an "updated brand".

The Clerk asked if members would you like to see a list of events, so that they could see what was going on already. She added that they had been asked about Armed Forces Day, but pointed out that "again, they're all clumped together". She reiterated that they weren't "just Lawley Parish Council, so you've got to be mindful of where you do it". She reminded members that they joined forces with Great Dawley Town Council (GDTC) for the Dawley Bank Christmas festival, and until then they didn't know that the residents' association in that area had reformed. She still had all the old association's documents and questioned why they had gone to GDTC and not LOPC.

The Clerk said that the staff would put a calendar together and send it over. Cllr Parker reiterated that they needed a "visible, clear plan of what we're doing".

Cllr Yorke moved on to the **Jubilee Event**. He pointed out that there were going to be grants available for holding Jubilee events. Jill Holland said that the staff were "well aware of that, and Simon [Bailey] had already started to investigate".

Cllr Yorke asked if everybody was happy with the events portion of the plan (3B). There were no comments.

Cllr Yorke moved on to the **partnership working** portion and asked for comments.

Cllr Parker said that if councillors thought a community school bus provision was important, then they needed to have that on as a plan. He also said that regarding facilitating their own initiatives and asking partners for assistance, then he thought that, as he had suggested last time, it needed to be something that underpinned everything they had on the development plan. He added that he didn't think they should be looking to do anything on the plan just by themselves, whether it's building a new community centre, Jubilee events, Christmas lights, they should be actively involving other people and trying to get support and partnerships. He thought this item should be separated and be an underpinning principle of everything they do.

The Clerk said that she thought they needed to be mindful of partnership working; it wasn't about the Parish Council going out, but that the Parish Council had been treated as "the cash cow" when it came to setting the budget. She highlighted that she had already been asked to write a business plan for the LPB for the barriers on the Wrekin Path to stop quad bikes, and the Parish Council had been asked to put the business case forward. It was circa £19,000, of which enforcement had put forward £11,000, and they were looking for the shortfall.

Cllr Yorke asked why the Parish Council was doing the business plan. He thought the LPB were happy to fund £4,000 on the basis that the Parish Council would contribute £4,000. He "pleaded poverty", and eventually the LPB would fund it all. The Clerk said things had moved on since then, as the Parish Council had questioned disability access, and there would be increased costs to address that. If the LPB did fund the £8,000, there would be additional costs of around £6,000, she said, so "we know who they'll be coming to". She said that the Parish Council didn't ask to lead on the idea, but that it was given to the PC to lead on it as it had been a prolonged problem for the parish and residents for several years.

Cllr Greenaway said that she was confused and asked at what point the Parish Council had agreed to do the business plan. The Clerk said it had been part of ongoing discussions with the Safer Neighbourhood Team (SNT) and CAT enforcement. Cllr Greenaway said that it was the Clerk's and staff team's time that they didn't have to give. Her point was that she was "annoyed" about the disability access, but that it was a public right of way, and she wondered why the Parish Council was being asked to do it when it was the Borough Council's responsibility. She pointed out that if it were TWC doing the work, they would be charging for it.



Cllr Parker agreed but pointed out that they were talking about the development plan, the Parish Council's priorities, and how to work with others. He said that they could set aside some money to work with others as they came to the Parish Council. All of this, he said, should underpin everything they were trying to do. He said that if something wasn't on the development plan, the Parish Council shouldn't be doing it. "We've identified enough priorities for this period of time", he added.

Cllr Greenaway said they had got big plans and they were getting side-tracked. She said she was "all for partnership working, but there is only so much the staff can do to facilitate the other bodies", adding that they had a "huge amount of work to get done".

Cllr Yorke said that they were "happy to work in partnership", but they had to be careful about "how thinly we spread ourselves". Cllr Parker reiterated that they had identified what the Parish Council's priorities were, and "if there's some crossover, we should look into that". He said that with everything they wanted to do, there would be some "other interested bodies with funding we could tap into".

Cllr Yorke said that they should welcome people approaching the Parish Council for partnership working, but "we've got to remember our own priorities".

Jill Holland said that it was important to say how the business plan for the barriers came about. From meetings with SNT and CAT Enforcement, and repeated contact with residents about anti-social behaviour and quad bikes, she said, the barriers came from a discussion with them about what could be done to prevent and eliminate as much anti-social behaviour as possible. It hadn't come from the LPB, she said, but rather the initial discussion came from those meetings, and then they were questioning how they could get help with funding.

Cllr Yorke moved on to the **LOPC 65s club**. He asked if anybody had sent any responses back for membership after the appeal in the winter newsletter. Ms Holland said they had received just under a dozen responses, adding that it was "a bit slow, but better than one". She said they had been coming in daily since the newsletter had dropped, and they expected more to appear.

The Clerk added that Simon Hayden, as part of Safer Stronger Communities, had indicated that he may be able to provide some data regarding Overdale, as "TWC not been forthcoming at all".

Cllr Greenaway said that regarding smoke alarms, CO2 products, the Community Fire Safety and the Fire Service would help, and they do it in the community, so it would be worth getting them on board. Ms Holland said she had made a contact with the fire responsible person during the consultation day, and he was very keen to become involved.

Cllr Yorke then moved on to 4C, progress the Lawley and Lightmoor Partnership Board via the Lawley Neighbourhood Partnership Board up to a value of £50,000, or five bids. He asked Cllr Parker to comment.

Cllr Parker said that what he was suggesting there was that they target £50,000 of support for things they were wanting to achieve. "Quad bikes are a problem", he said, "so let's get some". He added it was nothing specific, but they had already identified the things they thought were important. "It was promised after all", he added.

Cllr Yorke then moved on to finance, specifically obtaining a 1% interest rate on savings. He reiterated that staff could do nothing unless councillors became involved and attended meetings with banks. He asked if councillors agreed that it is still a problem and had to stay on the plan.

Cllr Parker said that if inflation was at 5%, "our cash is eroding".



The Clerk expressed her frustrations with the issue. She pointed out that they had been talking about it for 18 months and reiterated that staff couldn't do anything about it.

Cllr Yorke announced that he would take the matter on as a personal target, and that it would just be a case of reporting back to the councillors. He told councillors, "I will now say in the first few days of 2022, I will take that on with a lot more vengeance".

The Clerk said that there was a comment on 5a about councillors approving transactions on accounts. She said that they had talked about transferring £100,000 from Unity to HSBC, and £100,000 to Lloyds, but she had "put that in obeyance" as she didn't know what they would do in the interim. She said that the item of correspondence she had received was from HSBC, informing the Parish Council that its account would be inactive unless something was done with it by 13 January. She asked members if they wanted to take the opportunity to put £100,000 into HSBC anyway, to get it out of Unity, in which they currently had £400,000, versus £100,000 in HSBC.

Cllr Parker thought they had made the determination to move the money and keep it split up as much as possible. The Clerk said they had discussed it, but that it was far better to keep the money in one place. Cllr Parker said he didn't remember that. He said that if they were threatening to close the account, he wasn't sure if he wanted to put more in. The Clerk pointed out that they would then need to open an account somewhere else and asked again if members wanted her to move the money or not.

After a discussion, Cllr Yorke said they would have to "do the activity that's required". The Clerk suggested they moved £50,000, and then do a transfer every month to keep the account active, though it was up to councillors to decide how much to transfer each month. She added that they needed to move some money out of Unity anyway, so she was suggesting £50,000 initially, and then a monthly transfer of £5,000. This would give them scope for the next 12 months, she said, by which point they would have new accounts anyway and move it around.

Cllr Rob Parker **PROPOSED**, Cllr Jayne Greenaway **SECONDED**. All agreed.

- **ACTION 051: Clerk to make an initial transfer of £50,000 from Unity to HSBC and Lloyds Bank accounts, followed by a monthly transfer of £5,000 for the next 12 months.**

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.

2021/101 – Confidential items

Items were noted.

2021/102 – Agenda items for the next meeting

- Councillors to email any agenda items for the next meeting to the Clerk.



2021/103 – Date of next meeting

It was **noted** that the **Full Council** parish meeting would take place on **Thursday 27 January 2022 at 6pm**, at **The Carpenter Centre, Overdale.**

The meeting closed at 19:59.

Signed by Chairman:

Date:



Action record

Ref #	Minute #	Open date	Description	Assigned to	Target date	Date closed	Comments
001	2020/158	15/04/2021	Councillors to approve invoices for payment before Cllr Parker authorises them at the bank.	All councillors	Ongoing	N/A	
005	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	Will continue as and when required.
006	2020/160	15/04/2021	Councillors to respond in a timely manner to all emails marked as 'response required.'	All councillors	Ongoing	N/A	"Hopefully, we will become better boys and girls!" – Cllr John Yorke, 17/06/2021
034	2021/047	26/07/2021	Clerk to insist that TWC respond to their questions about PROW.	SG/JH	Ongoing	N/A	JH Ongoing dialogue with TWC
047	2021/085	11/11/2021	Clerk to chase up Highways regarding the promised works on Dawley Road.	SG	ONGOING		Highways chased on 2 sep. occasions
048	2021/086	11/11/2021	Clerk to contact Chris Pearson to find out Lawley and Overdale Parish Council's position on the TRO waiting list.	SG	16/12/2021		Still awaiting answers
049	2021/087	11/11/2021	Clerk to ask Paul Fenn about CAT records since April.	SG	16/12/2021		IN HAND
050	2021/089	11/11/2021	Clerk to contact TaxAssist and arrange the Pay roll contract beginning in April 2022	SG	01/04/2022	Forms completed Dec 2021	COMPLETED
051	2021/100	16/12/2021	Clerk to make an initial transfer of £50,000 from Unity to HSBC, & Lloyds followed by a monthly transfer of £5,000 for the next 12 months.	SG	27/01/2022	17.01.2022	COMPLETED

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.