

COUNCIL

15 OCTOBER 2019

PRESENT:

Councillors Cross (Vice-Chairman in the Chair), Anketell, Banevicius, Barnett, Binney, Birch, Brown, Checkland, Cox, Eadie, Eagland, D Ennis, L Ennis, Evans, Grange, Gwilt, Ho, Humphreys, Lax, Leytham, A Little, E Little, Matthews, Norman, Parton-Hughes, Pullen, Ray, Robertson, Silvester-Hall, Smith, Spruce, Strachan, Tapper, Warburton, Warfield, Westwood, White, M Wilcox, S Wilcox, A Yeates and B Yeates.

20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ball, Baker, Greatorex, Marshall, Powell and Salter.

21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Eagland declared an interest in Friary Grange Leisure Centre as a Member of Staffordshire County Council.

Councillor D Ennis declared an interest in the Leader's answer to question 2, Agenda Item 18 as a Director of Haywoods Blinds.

Councillor Pullen declared an interest in Friary Grange Leisure Centre as his wife was a Member of Staffordshire County Council.*

Councillor Norman declared an interest in Friary Grange Leisure Centre as his wife was a Member of Staffordshire County Council.*

Councillor A Little declared an interest in Friary Grange Leisure Centre as a Member of Staffordshire County Council.

Councillor E Little declared an interest in Friary Grange Leisure Centre as her husband was a Member of Staffordshire County Council.*

Councillor White declared an interest in Friary Grange Leisure Centre as a Member of Staffordshire County Council and a Member of the County Council's Property Sub-Committee.

(*a dispensation for this interest was granted by the Monitoring Officer prior to the meeting)

22 TO APPROVE AS A CORRECT RECORD THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting held on 16 July 2019 were approved as a correct record.

23 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

(a) Civic Ceremony

Members were thanked for their attendance at the Civic Ceremony held in Lichfield Cathedral.

(b) Events

Councillor Cross reported on the various events that he or the Chairman of the Council had attended since the last meeting.

(c) Former Councillor D Constable

It was reported that thanks had been received from former Councillor D Constable for the cards and good wishes he had received for his 90th birthday.

24 FRIARY GRANGE LEISURE CENTRE

It was reported that the Cabinet met on 7 October at Lichfield Garrick to receive and consider a petition signed by 11,000 people against the decision to close Friary Grange Leisure Centre from 1 April 2020.

Material changes since the original decision included a more favourable and flexible lease being offered by Staffordshire County Council, the ability to use S106 funds to part pay for refurbishment works and the high level of public support for keeping Friary Grange Leisure Centre open.

In proposing the recommendations set out in the report, Councillor E Little advised that the Cabinet had agreed that Friary Grange Leisure Centre should be kept open for up to 5 years based on a cap in the capital budget of £695k until such time that a replacement facility could be built, with a capital budget of £5m being allocated to facilitate this.

Seconding the proposals Councillor Eadie noted that while Burntwood Leisure Centre had benefited from £1.5m of investment, Friary Grange Leisure Centre and Lichfield in general had received no such investment in leisure facilities. He said residents has spoken and the Cabinet has listened.

Councillor Eadie said the Council could not be reckless with its finances and indeed the S151 Officer and Chief Executive had written to highlight the impact of the decision on the Council's finances, however, the Council had to recognise the voice of the electors subject to the funding cap outlined by Councillor E Little.

Councillor Norman criticised the decision to hold the meeting in the Garrick. He said if the matter had been referred back to scrutiny, in the light of the new information received, the decision could have been arrived at earlier without the expense of hiring the Garrick for a decision that had already been made.

Councillor Pullen said it had been an exercise in openness and transparency and the meeting had been moved to the Garrick to accommodate as many people as possible. He said people had been given the opportunity to speak and he was proud of the outcome.

Councillor Grange welcomed the decision but said questions remained including the Sports England clawback clause. She suggested the £85,000 loss of income figure should be subject to further negotiation and any changes to the Friary Grange Leisure Contract should be subject to Overview and Scrutiny.

Councillor Anketell expressed concern over the risk to the Council's financial standing and invited Members to sign the letter he would be sending to Central Government requesting extra funding. He noted financial assistance had been provided to some other authorities following lobbying.

Councillor Strachan said he had read Councillor Anketell's letter, however the Council was lobbying the Government through its consultation process, highlighting that preventative services provided by district level authorities reduced pressure on acute services operated by top tier authorities and should be funded appropriately.

Councillor White mentioned the extensive lobbying work undertaken by Councillor Wilcox and others over the past ten years.

It was proposed by Councillor E Little, seconded by Councillor Eadie and

RESOLVED: (1) That the Medium Term Financial Strategy be updated to:

- Add a project to refurbish the Friary Grange Leisure Centre to the Capital Programme up to a capped level of £695,000. The funding will be provided by £153,000 of eligible Section 106, an Earmarked Reserve – Sinking Fund of £17,000 and an Earmarked Reserve – VAT Repayment of £525,000.
- Add the revenue implications totalling £828,000 with funding provided by the Earmarked Reserve – VAT Repayment of £120,000 and the Revenue Budget of £708,000.
- Add a project for the contribution of £5,000,000 to the Capital Programme to provide for future leisure facilities. The funding will be provided by borrowing with relevant Prudential Indicators being updated as part of the refresh of the Medium Term Financial Strategy.
- Add the revenue implications to the Revenue Budget for the ongoing cost of borrowing of £294,000.

(2) Delegated authority be granted to the Cabinet Member for Recycling and Leisure and the Director of Place and Community:

- To approve a new 7-year lease with Staffordshire County Council for future use of FGLC.
- To approve compliance contracts for the continued safe operation of Friary Grange Leisure Centre from May 2020.
- To approve a new agreement with Greywood Multi-schools Trust for the shared parts of Friary Grange Leisure Centre.
- To approve a contract for the refurbishment works at Friary Grange Leisure Centre.
- To approve an amended contract with Freedom Leisure based on the removal of the sports hall and all weather pitch.
- To Commission services/works to progress with the leisure centre options appraisal.

25 REPORT OF THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL ON CABINET DECISIONS FROM THE MEETINGS HELD ON 10 SEPTEMBER, 7 OCTOBER AND 8 OCTOBER 2019 AND CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS

The report of the Leader of the Council was received.

1 – Money Matters 2019/20: Review of Financial Performance against the Financial Strategy

Details were given of the three new posts funded by the Economic Growth budget.

4 – Birmingham Road Lichfield, Enabling Works – Selection of Tender

It was confirmed that 36 artworks would be provided on the site hoardings to promote the District.

Councillor Birch expressed concern about the cost and impression created by the interim toilets. Councillor Pullen said the area served as an important transport hub and as part of the project it would be necessary to provide high quality non-permanent facilities.

7 – Replacement Combined Heat and Power Unit and Burntwood Leisure Centre

Councillor E Little advised that she had declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest at the Cabinet meeting in connection with this item.

26 MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF STRATEGIC (OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE

Councillor A Little submitted the Minutes of the Strategic (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee held on 12 September 2019.

12 – Commercial Property Acquisition

Councillor Eadie updated Members on the latest CIPFA guidance in respect of commercial property acquisitions. He noted that an update to the property investment strategy reflecting this guidance would be taken to the Strategic (O&S) Committee.

In response to a question Councillor Strachan acknowledged that the Public Works Loan Board had increased the cost of new borrowing.

27 MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE

Councillor Cox submitted the Minutes of the Economic Growth, Environment and Development (Overview & Scrutiny) Committee held on 18 September 2019.

28 MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF LEISURE, PARKS AND WASTE MANAGEMENT (OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE

Councillor Matthews submitted the Minutes of the Leisure, Parks and Waste Management (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee held on 25 September 2019.

11 – Work Programme

Councillor Norman asked for assurance that Friary Grange Leisure Centre would be on the Work Programme, including progress on the new project. Councillor Matthews confirmed that Friary Grange Leisure Centre would feature on the work programme.

12 – Resources and Waste Strategy for England

Councillor Norman stressed the importance of the Resources and Waste Strategy document. He noted the cost of providing weekly food collections in Lichfield and Tamworth was estimated to be around £1 million per annum and although the Strategy stated that the Government would ensure local authorities were resourced to meet any new costs, he said he had little confidence that this would happen.

Councillor Norman also referred to the improvements in recycling rates from 1995 onwards and regretted the government's decision to abandon targets.

Councillor Wilcox said he had expressed grave concerns about some government proposals including the possible loss of income from garden waste. He said it was important to lobby government and the two MP's within the Joint Waste Board area, and highlight the need to be able to make decisions locally.

Councillor E Little confirmed that a letter had been drafted to assist with lobbying.

29 THE CHAIRMEN INDICATED BELOW TO MOVE THAT THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE FOLLOWING COMMITTEES BE RECEIVED AND, WHERE NECESSARY, APPROVED AND ADOPTED.

(a) Audit and Member Standards Committee – 24 July 2019

It was proposed by Councillor Ho “that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Audit and Member Standards Committee held on 24 July 2019 be approved and adopted.”

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the Meeting of the Audit and Member Standards Committee held on 24 July 2019 be approved and adopted.

(b) Planning Committee – 29 July 2019

It was proposed by Councillor Cox “that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 29 July 2019 be approved and adopted.”

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 29 July 2019 be approved and adopted.

(c) Planning Committee – 2 September 2019

It was proposed by Councillor Cox “that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 2 September 2019 be approved and adopted.”

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 2 September 2019 be approved and adopted.

(d) Employment Committee – 24 September 2019

It was proposed by Councillor Humphreys “that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Employment Committee held on 24 September 2019 be approved and adopted subject to the Chairman and Vice-Chairman being identified in the list of those present and the final paragraph of Minute 11 being amended to read:

‘Members were pleased with the report and *some Members* felt it was a reflection of choice and society which was actually a positive and not a negative.’

Councillor Ray asked about the balance between the apprenticeship levy paid and apprenticeship funding claimed by the Authority.

Councillor Birch noted that the Committee had discussed reasons why it was difficult to establish apprenticeships, including limited career opportunities and pathways. Councillor Pullen agreed that career paths in local government were important.

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the Meeting of the Employment Committee held on 24 September 2019 as amended be approved and adopted.

(e) Planning Committee – 30 September 2019

It was proposed by Councillor Cox “that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 30 September 2019 be approved and adopted.”

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 30 September 2019 be approved and adopted.

30 MONEY MATTERS 2019/20 - REVIEW OF FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE AGAINST THE FINANCIAL STRATEGY

Consideration was given to recommendations to update the Medium Term Financial Strategy made at the Cabinet meeting held on 10 September 2019.

Councillor Evans welcomed the increase in disabled facilities grants and emphasised the need to ensure effective delivery.

Councillor Robertson highlighted the importance of affordable housing.

It was proposed by Councillor Strachan, seconded by Councillor Eadie and

RESOLVED: That the Medium Term Financial Strategy be updated:

- To increase the Economic Growth Budget by £50,000 in 2019/20 and £100,000 in each subsequent year to reflect the inclusion of three new posts to support this Council priority.
- To increase the Disabled Facilities Grants budget in 2019/20 from £1,714,000 to £1,948,000 with the additional spend funded by £234,000 of additional external grant.
- To increase the Affordable Housing budget in 2019/20 from £400,000 to £614,000 with the additional spend funded by £214,000 of Section 106.
- To reduce the Stowe Pool Improvements project from £1,000,000 to £50,000 to reflect the removal of the Heritage Lottery Grant of £950,000.

31 BIRMINGHAM ROAD ENABLING WORKS - UPDATE TO THE MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY

It was reported that planning permission was granted by the District Council acting as local planning authority on the 29th July 2019 for enabling works on Birmingham Road, Lichfield pending a long term re-development proposal coming forward. The permission, subject to the discharge of conditions, provided for the demolition of the existing police station buildings and

bus station kiosk/toilet buildings, consent for car parking on the police station site, and the remodelling of the existing bus station to include additional coach parking, the erection of replacement bus shelters, temporary toilet facilities and associated landscaping works.

A tender process was followed to appoint a contractor to undertake the above works and Cabinet at its meeting on the 10th September determined that this should be awarded to Coleman and Company.

Due to additional costs being incurred an update to the Medium Term Financial Strategy would be required to facilitate implementation of the enabling works scheme.

It was therefore proposed by Councillor Eadie, seconded by Councillor Strachan and

RESOLVED: The Medium Term Financial Strategy be updated to increase the Project Budget for the Birmingham Road Site by £185,000 from £2,995,000 to £3,180,000 with funding of £182,000 provided by the Earmarked Reserve and £3,000 from the Revenue Budget.

32 MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY - BUDGET ASSUMPTIONS AND BUDGET PRINCIPLES

Consideration was given to the budget assumptions and budget principles for the Medium Term Financial Strategy as recommended for approval by Cabinet at its meeting on 8 October 2019.

It was proposed by Councillor Strachan, seconded by Councillor Eadie and

RESOLVED: That the budget assumptions and budget principles for the Medium Term Financial Strategy as set out in the report be approved.

33 DESIGNATION OF MONITORING OFFICER

Members were advised that the Local Government and Housing Act (1989) obliged the Council to nominate one of its officers as its Monitoring Officer.

The previous Monitoring Officer, the former Head of Legal, Property and Democratic Services, left the employment of the Council on the 14 April 2019 and Christie Tims, Head of Corporate Services was appointed as Interim Monitoring Officer in April 2019.

Following amendments to the Head of Corporate Services post, approval was sought for the formal appointment of Ms Tims to the role of Monitoring Officer.

It was proposed by Councillor Lax, seconded by Councillor E Little and

RESOLVED: That the designation of Christie Tims, Head of Corporate Services as the Monitoring Officer be approved.

(CHRISTIE TIMS DECLARED A PECUNIARY INTEREST AND LEFT THE ROOM DURING CONSIDERATION OF THIS ITEM)

34 AMENDMENTS TO THE CONTRACT PROCEDURE RULES

It was reported that the Council's Contract Procedure Rules had been reviewed to increase efficiency and ensure they reflected best practice.

The recommended changes had been reviewed by Audit and Member Standards Committee which had, in addition, recommended the clarification of approvals required for extensions to contracts.

It was proposed by Councillor Lax, seconded by Councillor Strachan and

RESOLVED: That the updated Contract Procedure Rules (Part 4 Section 7 of the Council's Constitution) be adopted.

35 MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES AND OUTSIDE BODIES

It was proposed by Councillor Pullen and

RESOLVED: (1) That Councillor Tapper be appointed as Vice-Chairman of Strategic (Overview & Scrutiny) Committee.

(2) That Councillor Tapper be appointed to replace Councillor Ray on the Lichfield Garrick Trust.

(3) That Councillors Cox, Barnett, Birch and Matthews be appointed to the Community Infrastructure Levy Joint Member Officer Group

36 MOTIONS ON NOTICE

The following Motion was submitted by Councillor Robertson:

"This Council asks Scrutiny and Cabinet members to look into the possibility of developing a local procurement policy to support Small and Medium Enterprises based within the District Council's boundary.

The current Economic Development Strategy and the Strategic Plan both have references to supporting local businesses and related matters. However, they do not include the direct help the Council could be to the district economy if it had a local procurement policy and we call upon the Council to investigate the merits of such a policy for our local businesses in Lichfield District."

Councillor Strachan agreed on the importance of the local economy, which he said had been prioritised in the Economic Development Strategy and the Strategic Plan, was required by statute and had been referenced in the procurement rules that had just been approved. He said practical application was key and he was always willing to see what could be done for economic development and would be happy to consider a local procurement policy.

Councillor Eadie supported the motion noting the framework agreement with Wolverhampton City Council was coming to an end and the Council would be examining future options.

Councillor Norman in seconding the motion noted that there were models in other parts of the country and the aim was to build social value and help local companies do business with the Council. He thanked the opposition for their support.

Councillor Robertson thanked all the speakers and said he was happy to have further discussions.

It was then

RESOLVED: That the Motion as submitted by approved.

37 QUESTIONS

Q1. Question from Councillor Grange to the Cabinet Member for Legal & Regulatory

I attended the Planning Committee meeting on 30 September as an observer and in support of residents who were objecting to a planning application, and there appeared to be a significant amount of confusion about the advice given on the night on which members may or not be able to vote on each application if they were also councillors at a parish level. This advice suggested that where members had cast a vote at parish level they would need to declare an interest and not vote at district level, and when clarification of this advice was sought by members at the time, it was suggested that they may even need to leave the chamber. This is despite the disclaimers that I know are given at Lichfield City Council that any views given at parish level are preliminary and may change where city councillors sit on the district council's Planning Committee.

If the advice given is correct, and dual hatted members are not able to vote at a district level if they have voted at a parish level, it would appear that the composition of the Planning Committee needs urgent review and previous decisions may need to be reviewed if members who should have been precluded have voted on particular applications. Equally if the advice given was incorrect, then we need to review how members are advised.

At the request of some residents who are well versed in the operations of the Planning Committee, I was asked to clarify why the advice given appears to have changed the way the process operates, and I sought advice so I could provide an answer. I have yet to receive an explanation.

Can I please ask for definitive information on the voting position of members of the Planning Committee who are also parish councillors and what actions are going to be taken to ensure that this sort of confusion is avoided in the future?

The Cabinet Member for Legal & Regulatory responded:

(i) Can I please ask for definitive information on the voting position of members of the Planning Committee who are also parish councillors?

Predisposition and predetermination applies to all councillors whether they are parish councillors or not.

Lichfield District Council's planning committee councillors can be on their parish planning committee as they are not determining the decision at parish level.

At meetings of a parish council planning meeting, councillors who are also members of Lichfield District Council's planning committee make a declaration to confirm that their comments at the parish meeting are a preliminary view and that they might change their view when they hear all of the evidence at the District council's planning committee.

S25 of The Localism Act 2011 provides that a councillor should not be regarded as having a closed mind (predetermination) simply because they previously did or said something that, directly or indirectly, indicated what view they might take in relation to

any particular matter. Councillors may campaign and represent their constituents and then speak or vote on an application, provided that while they may have demonstrated a particular view to date and so are predisposed, they do not demonstrate a closed mind and a predetermined view.

A councillor in this position will need to apply an objective test of whether the reasonable onlooker with knowledge of the relevant facts, would consider that the councillor was biased. Parish councillors who are also members of Lichfield District Council's planning committee can take part at both levels provided they make it clear they come with an open mind to make a decision and they are not predetermined.

If a councillor has predetermined their position, i.e. committed themselves to a particular view on a planning issue before it is considered at committee, such that their mind is no longer open to consideration of the merits of the case, the councillor should withdraw from being a member of the committee for the consideration for that matter, and take no part in the debate or vote on the application.

(ii) What actions are going to be taken to ensure that this sort of confusion is avoided in future?

Action already has been taken. A planning briefing was held for all members of the planning committee, with the Monitoring Officer, Planning Solicitor and Planning Development Manager, on Monday 14 October to learn from the situation councillors found themselves in at the committee meeting on 30 September.

Following the briefing the Monitoring Officer has reaffirmed the guidance which was emailed to all members before the committee meeting. If councillors are unsure of their position on the issue of predisposition/predetermination and bias in respect of any application, they should discuss it with the Monitoring Officer in advance of the planning committee meeting, so then they can make the correct decision.

The guidance together with links to the LGA's booklet online, 'Probity in planning for councillors and officers' will be circulated to all Parish Clerks. The Chairs of Lichfield and Burntwood parish planning committees attended the above briefing and have been asked to note the above at their next parish planning committee meetings.

Councillor Grange then asked the following supplementary question:

'Can we ensure we look at the general points raised rather than just the specifics covered by the question?'

Councillor Lax responded:

'I was asked a specific question. I will take note of the comments but the question has been answered.'

Q2 Question from Councillor Westwood to the Leader of the Council

Following last week's Cabinet decision to recommend to Full Council to "*amend the MTFs further by adding a contribution of £5m to the capital programme to provide for future leisure facilities in Lichfield*", would the leader of the council also be addressing the inequity of the Capital Investment across the district as a whole, specifically in the lack of proposed investment into Burntwood and the Rural Communities? Perhaps the previously suggested investment of £1 million into Burntwood, and £750,000 into the rural areas would be a good start?

The Leader of the Council responded:

The capital budget is currently planned over a rolling five-year period and is reviewed annually as part of the budget setting process, as set out in our financial procedure rules. It requires specific projects for capital to be attributed to, which are then assessed against set criteria. The location of the project is not, in and of itself, one of those criteria.

The current capital programme for 2019/2020 includes projects in both Burntwood and several of the villages within the District, as well as a number of projects which are spread across the entirety of the District, such as Disabled Facilities Grants.

In recent years we have enabled a £1.5million investment into Burntwood Leisure Centre, and have just last week signed off an additional sum of up to £235,000 for the centre.

It is not just capital investment which can bring about economic growth in an area - our policies can help boost the local economy too.

Through our local plan review process we will be seeking to ensure there is a focus on giving both Burntwood and our rural villages the opportunity to grow and become more sustainable, with the facilities they would want to have and protect.

We are currently reviewing what we can do to see more of the regeneration taking place in locations such as Sankey's Corner, where Snap Fitness and Costa Coffee have opened up - and where a local blinds company is due to open very shortly on the former Barclays bank site.

Councillor Westwood asked the following supplementary question:

'Burntwood is more than Burntwood Leisure Centre and Sankey's Corner, with 4 industrial business parks, 70 business at High Street Chasetown, 50 at Swan Island, 12 at Morley Road and 9 at Parkhill. Could the leader acknowledge the need for investment to be shared to support all these areas in Burntwood?'

The Leader of the Council responded:

'I can confirm that the Council's programme will look at the whole District. Location is not a criteria per se against which we will make investment decisions. It is quite correct that Burntwood is not just Burntwood Leisure Centre and Sankeys Corner, and we will look at options across the District at every opportunity.'

Q3 Question from Councillor Norman to the Chairman of Strategic (Overview & Scrutiny) Committee

I tried to raise this issue at the last meeting of Strategic (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee but was prevented from doing so and have to raise it now. With this Council and others now accepting the importance of the environment again to our residents – and the generations to come – does he not think that Lichfield District Council should reintroduce a section on each report to Scrutiny that considers the Environmental Impact of any proposed decisions as we do with equality and diversity and crime and safety considerations?

The Chairman of Strategic (Overview & Scrutiny) Committee responded:

I find it surprising that Councillor Norman feels he was not given sufficient chance to raise this issue. Councillor Norman attended the preparatory meeting as Vice Chairman of the committee and also the Committee itself where all members were given every opportunity to properly scrutinise pre-cabinet documents and speak on issue of importance. Such claims he was prevented from raising issues are simply not true.

The topic raised in this question is a very important one and not one which requires party games to be played out in a public arena. However, I understand that the reporting templates are currently under review, and that the inclusion of Environmental Impact has already been discussed, along with a number of other changes which will aid good decision making processes.

Councillor Norman asked the following supplementary question:

‘Can I ask the Chairman to consider the version of events again. I am referring to the meeting of Strategic (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee where I recall that I wanted to raise an issue that I thought was close to all our hearts, the environment, and that perhaps in future we could look at having environmental impact included in all reports, as this Council has done in the past. However, he did in fact stop me from asking this question.

I would also be grateful for an explanation of what is meant in the answer by ‘party games in the public arena?’

The Chairman of Strategic (Overview & Scrutiny) Committee responded:

‘I am surprised by the question. Yes it is an important topic and answered by the fact that it has been discussed and the Cabinet will be looking to make proposals to ensure good decision making which will of course include the environment.

As to the question of party games, as Vice-Chairman you approved the Minutes both confidential and from the meeting held in public. You have sent an email that reads ‘I believe they capture all the matters raised in public and private’. The comments raised do not appear in the Minutes so cannot have been considered very important, or made in an open meeting where Members undertook splendid scrutiny of the report.’

Q4 Question from Councillor Norman to the Chairman of Community, Housing and Health (Overview & Scrutiny) Committee

The new Chairman of Community, Housing and Health (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee will know that the Burntwood Health and Wellbeing Centre in Chasetown, Burntwood has now been granted, for the third time, temporary planning permission again for the temporary buildings. The original application in 2008 was for a “Proposed development to construct a two storey modular building on a temporary basis for a NHS Walk In Health Clinic.” Can she tell me the last time the future of the now named Health and Wellbeing Centre was raised at the Staffordshire Health Select Committee or discussed at a meeting of this Committee?

The Chairman of Community, Housing and Health (Overview & Scrutiny) Committee responded:

The Healthy Staffordshire Select Committee, of which I am a member, has a broad remit covering the provision of health and care services for around 870,000 people across Staffordshire. The committee does not tend to discuss individual health or care centres unless they are part of a broader consultation process, for example, the committee discussed the George Bryan Centre engagement plans at its meeting on 15 July 19 after a fire had resulted in the centre being closed.

The Healthy Staffordshire Select Committee has looked at the Sustainability and Transformation Plan for Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent which include plans for the delivery of Primary Care, and Urgent and Emergency Care. These plans will help determine the physical infrastructure that will be required for the future. Whilst the work on the care needs of our communities are being undertaken, Councillor Norman can be assured that I will be lobbying for the right physical infrastructure to support our community's needs in Lichfield District.

The work stream lead for estates in the Sustainability and Transformation Plan for Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent is John Henderson, the Chief Executive of Staffordshire County Council. I will ensure your concerns about the walk in centre in Burntwood are drawn to his attention. Furthermore, Councillor Norman can raise questions about health and care provision at Staffordshire's Health and Wellbeing Board which has public session at the start of every meeting.

Councillor Norman asked the following supplementary question:

'Forgive my lack of confidence in the Chairman's lobbying abilities but with all but one of the PCTs in Staffordshire in deficit, with more homes being built and with Burntwood having had a temporary building since 2008, in her view is it not an issue for health scrutiny in Lichfield District?'

The Chairman of Community Housing and Health (Overview & Scrutiny) Committee responded:

'The answer is in the third paragraph of my answer. If Councillor Norman is not happy with the response I will be very happy to refer the matter to the Chief Executive of Staffordshire County Council.'

38 EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

RESOLVED: That as publicity would be prejudicial to the public interest by reason of the confidential nature of the business to be transacted, the public and press be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business which would involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

39 CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES OF STRATEGIC (OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE

Councillor A Little submitted the confidential Minutes of the Strategic (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee held on 12 September 2019. It was noted that the commercial property referred to had subsequently been removed from the market.

(The Meeting closed at 7.40 pm)

CHAIRMAN