

COUNCIL

14 JULY 2020

PRESENT:

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

77 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Brown.

78 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Norman declared an interest in the Burntwood Neighbourhood Plan as Chairman of Burntwood Town Council's Neighbourhood Plan Task Group.

Councillor Pullen declared an interest in any discussions concerning disabled facilities grants as an application had been made for a member of his family.

Councillor Evans declared an interest in CASES as a Trustee.

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

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 18 February 2020 were approved as a correct record.

80 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman advised that the following former Members had sadly passed away:

Former Councillor Neil Roberts.

Former Councillor Roberts served as a Member of the Council representing Kings Bromley and Longdon Ward from 1999 until 2015.

He served on many Committees and would be remembered as the Cabinet Member for Development Services which he undertook from 2004 to 2012. During this time he oversaw membership of the Local Enterprise Partnerships and the Heritage Lottery Fund Lichfield Parks Project.

Former Councillor John T. Walker MBE

Former Councillor Walker served as a Member of the Council representing Chase Terrace ward from 1979 to 2007 and 2011 to 2015. He served as Chairman of the District Council from 1995 to 1996.

He became a Member of the Order of the British Empire for his services to the community and was also a Justice of the Peace. He would also be remembered for the charity work he undertook including for the Burntwood Live at Home Scheme.

Former Councillor Alan Pearce,

Former Councillor Pearce served as a Member of the Council representing the Ward of Fazeley from 2011 to 2014. During this time he served on Overview and Scrutiny Committees, Employment and Regulatory & Licensing Committee and would be remembered for his work representing and working with the residents of his ward.

Former Councillor Howard Russell Heath

Former Councillor Heath served as a Member of the Council for Chase Terrace from 1973 to 76 and Boney Hay from 1979 to 2015.

He served on Overview and Scrutiny Committees and numerous other committees during his terms, and would be remembered for his continuous work on planning committee, helping to shape the district for its residents.

A minutes silence was held for the former Members of the Council and everyone who had suffered loss during the Covid19 Pandemic.

81 REPORT OF THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL ON CABINET DECISIONS FROM THE MEETINGS HELD ON 12 MAY, 2 JUNE AND 7 JULY 2020 AND CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS

Councillor Pullen gave an overview of the action taken during the pandemic noting that the response illustrated the very best of local government and local communities. He said councillors from all parties had stepped forward to do what was needed and the Council had ensured continuity of service.

Highlights included setting up teams to work from home, ensuring the bin rounds continued despite a 40% increase in waste, the distribution of £20 million in grants, offering accommodation to all those sleeping rough, raising £25,000 for a local corona virus relief fund and pioneering a priority shopping system using a concept that was then rolled out across the country. Meanwhile normal business continued and few items had slipped. Councillor Pullen referred to the altruism of communities the dedication of councillors and the expertise, long hours and determination of officers.

Councillor Pullen then submitted his report.

Councillor Ray endorsed the Leaders comments and referencing the Medium Term Financial Strategy asked if there had been further indications from central government about funding. Councillor Pullen advised that the Chancellor would be reimbursing 75 pence in the pound for losses over 5%.

Councillor Norman offered his party's support for Councillor Pullen's comments and he hoped public services would be appreciated even more in the future.

82 MINUTES OF LEISURE, PARKS & WASTE MANAGEMENT (OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE - 3 MARCH 2020

Councillor Matthews submitted the Minutes of the Leisure, Parks and Waste Management (Overview & Scrutiny) Committee meeting held 3 March 2020.

83 MINUTES OF ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENVIRONMENT & DEVELOPMENT (OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE - 11 MARCH & 9 JUNE 2020

Councillor Cox submitted the Minutes of the Economic Growth, Environment and Development (Overview & Scrutiny) Committee meetings held on 11 March and 9 June 2020.

Councillor Norman questioned the Minutes of the Economic Growth, Environment and Development (Overview & Scrutiny) Committee on 9 June. He said there had been four attempts to reject the Masterplan and the vote on the day was not recorded in the Minutes. He also referred to comments made during the Local Plan debate, and the subsequent apology by the Deputy Leader. He said the meeting appeared to him to result in the resignation of the Chairman of the main scrutiny Committee and the promotion of the Chairman of the Committee to the Cabinet.

Councillor Ball thanked Councillor Cox for his help and support during his term as Vice-Chairman and hoped the future relationship in his new role would not be too adversarial.

Councillor Ray welcomed the fact that a review of the Masterplan had taken place to consider the impact of Covid and said he would like to know more about the funding strategy.

Councillor Cox said consideration of the funding strategy would be down to the new Chairman to take forward and he thanked Councillor Ball for his support as Vice-Chairman.

With regard to the meeting itself, he noted that a briefing paper had been circulated and the video recording was clear in terms of the outcome. In terms of the robustness of Scrutiny he was pleased that the meeting had delivered changes going forward. Councillor Cox advised that the Minutes recorded both the vote declared during the meeting and the corrected outcome for approval by the Committee.

Councillor E Little advised a report would be coming to Scrutiny during the Autumn on the deliverability and viability of the Birmingham Road site.

84 MINUTES OF COMMUNITY, HOUSING AND HEALTH (OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE - 18 MARCH 2020

Councillor Eagland submitted the Minutes of the Community, Housing and Health (Overview & Scrutiny) Committee meeting held on 18 March 2020.

Councillor Robertson referred to the Lichfield Late Night Listeners and the important work they undertook.

Councillor Ball expressed disappointment that 'children under 10 on upper floors' was being removed as a priority category in the housing allocations scheme.

85 MINUTES OF STRATEGIC (OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE - 23 JUNE 2020

Councillor Norman submitted the Minutes of the Strategic (Overview & Scrutiny) Committee meetings held on 23 June 2020.

Councillor Norman noted that letters sent by Capita to members of the public in connection with the single person's discount directed people to use the internet as the default option. He asked if the letters could be made more user friendly for people who did not use the internet, which would be consistent with the Council's Engagement Strategy.

Cllr Strachan said the District Council had little control over the letter sent by Capita since they were commissioned by the County Council, however he was aware of its tone and a mystery shopper exercise had found the telephone message to be unsatisfactory. He said work was underway with the programme's managers to try and improve the tone and the Council was taking steps to ensure its own signposting was sensitive.

Councillor A Little said he wished to clarify that his resignation as Chairman of Strategic (O&S) Committee was not primarily based on the result of the vote at the Economic Growth, Environment and Development (Overview & Scrutiny) Committee or the chairing of the Committee, it was far wider and he had made his reasoning clear and he would like Cllr Norman to retract the comments that he resigned singularly on that result.

Councillor Norman said it was not what he recalled saying however if the recording indicated otherwise he would happily apologise.

86 MINUTES OF REGULATORY & LICENSING COMMITTEE - 25 FEBRUARY 2020

It was proposed by Councillor B Yeates, duly seconded and

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting held on 25 February 2020 be approved and adopted.

87 MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE - 9 MARCH, 5 MAY AND 1 JUNE 2020

It was proposed by Councillor Marshall that the Minutes of the meetings on 9 March, 5 May and 1 June be approved and adopted.

Councillor Norman referred to the meeting on 1 June and complimented the Chairman on the way he ensured declarations of interest were declared at the meeting. He also commented that a number of Members appeared to consider that they knew more about Highways than the County Council Highway Officer.

Councillor Marshall responded that holding meetings on a virtual platform had been a steep learning curve and he thanked everyone for their efforts.

It was duly seconded and

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meetings held on 9 March, 5 May and 1 June 2020 be approved and adopted.

88 MINUTES OF STRATEGIC ASSET MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - 11 JUNE 2020

It was proposed by Councillor Eadie, duly seconded and

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting held on 11 June 2020 be approved and adopted.

89 MINUTES OF EMPLOYMENT COMMITTEE - 1 JULY 2020

It was proposed by Councillor Humphreys, duly seconded and

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meetings held on 1 July 2020 be approved and adopted.

90 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMEN, VICE-CHAIRMEN AND MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES.

Councillor Pullen moved that the appointments of Chairmen, Vice-Chairmen and Members to Committees as set out in the papers previously circulated be approved.

Councillor Norman said he was sorry to report that Councillor Brown had resigned and therefore the report would need to be amended accordingly.

He said Councillor Brown had become aware of comments on the internet and social media about the fact that, despite his best efforts, he didn't use the internet. Councillor Norman said he had been a great ward Member and there appeared to be some ignorance about what a Councillor actually does, and that it goes beyond attending meetings. However Councillor Brown and his family had been caused considerable distress by the vilification on social media and he had resigned from the District Council.

Councillor Evans said Councillor Brown had been a hard working, competent and committed ward councillor and it was disgraceful that he had been hounded and treated this way on social media, to the extent he felt it was necessary to take this action. She said there was far more to being a Councillor than attending meetings and the criticism showed people did not understand the work of a Councillor. She thanked him for his contribution and said it was a sad day for everyone especially considering people of all ages should be encouraged to stand. Furthermore Councillor Brown had been elected before the Covid-19 Pandemic and was attending meetings prior to the restrictions.

Councillor Humphreys said he was sad to hear that Councillor Brown had resigned and he had been a wonderful friend.

Councillor Marshall said he was saddened that Councillor Brown had decided to resign and the reasons behind it. He said he had been a member of Planning Committee since he was elected and had been a valued member. He asked that the Council's best wishes be sent to Councillor Brown.

Councillor D Ennis said he had tried to explain the situation Councillor Brown was in during the pandemic not in terms of age but ill health and the fact he was socially distancing himself for health and safety reasons. He had tried to help Councillor Brown get online, noting sometimes people struggle but they deserved support. Councillor D Ennis said Councillor Brown had been taking precautions and not doing anything wrong. He then gave details of some of the posts and comments that had been made on social media.

Councillor D Ennis said he had been continuing his casework and the fact he could not use technology or attend meetings during a pandemic did not mean he was not an asset to the Council and the Community. He said Councillor Brown had joined the Council because he loved his community and where he lived and he was saddened by the loss of a Councillor who was an asset to his town.

Councillor S Wilcox referred to Lichfield Live and attacks on Councillors and their families. She felt it was damning on the Council and needed to be stopped.

Councillor Greatorex said he thought it was wrong to cite Lichfield Live as the problem since it was more a case of certain individuals than the publication.

Councillor Grange said when you put yourself up for election it is right to expect a level of scrutiny. Where that scrutiny becomes offensive it is possible to block and not read the comments. In the case of Councillor Brown some of the comments were unacceptable and the use of the telephone should have been encouraged as a solution. She said singling out any part of the media was dangerous since it presented Members as not being transparent and open to scrutiny.

Councillor Checkland said Councillor Brown had his sympathy. He said he had come under the social media spot light in relation to Friary Grange Leisure Centre and it had caused enormous personal anguish and he felt some of that was fuelled from within the Council. He said he hoped those watching realised the pressures that Councillors come under when taking up the role.

Councillor Pullen said the overriding objective was for the Council to be open and transparent. That did not mean that some comments are not abhorrent but the overriding objective was to be open and transparent as councillors but he hoped people would recognise the enormous pressure that falls on individual councillors.

It was seconded by Councillor Eadie and

RESOLVED: the appointments of Chairmen, Vice-Chairmen and Members to Committees as set out in the papers previously circulated be approved.

91 ANNUAL TREASURY MANAGEMENT REPORT

Consideration was given to a report confirming that the Council was compliant with all Treasury Limits and Prudential Indicators for 2019/20.

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

RESOLVED: That the actual 2019/20 Prudential Indicators contained within the report be approved.

92 TO APPROVE THE HOUSING, HOMELESSNESS AND ROUGH SLEEPING STRATEGY 2019-2024

Consideration as given to the Housing, Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy 2019-2024 which set out the Council's plans to tackle homelessness, rough sleeping and a range of other housing-related challenges in Lichfield District from 2019 to 2024.

The strategy provided a position statement setting out the Council's strategic priorities and objectives across all housing tenures. The strategy reflected on performance and achievements since the last strategies were published, examined the housing and homelessness challenges faced in the district and explained how the Council and its partners would address these challenges.

For the first time, the housing strategy and the homelessness strategy had been combined into one document. The combined approach ensured homelessness and rough sleeping were not seen in isolation but within a wider framework, which covered the causes of and solutions to challenges such as access to affordable and suitable accommodation and the provision of and access to support and housing for vulnerable households. The approach would ensure a comprehensive and joined up approach to all matters relating to housing, homelessness and rough sleeping.

In moving the recommendations Councillor Lax thanked all the officers involved and stressed the importance of the integrated strategy as the District emerged from lockdown.

Councillor Ball commended the staff involved with the report, welcomed the integrated approach and wished Councillor Lax well in her new role. He referred to the priorities identified in the report and questioned how these would be achieved given the poor record in delivering genuinely affordable housing. Councillor Ball urged Councillor Lax and the Cabinet to purpose the new housing company to provide housing for rent rather than sale and increase the number of affordable homes provided through S106 agreements.

Councillor Robertson also welcomed the integrated approach as a step in the right direction. He said the report was well researched and noted the increase in completions of affordable housing. He highlighted the unmet need for affordable two bedroom houses for rent and that the free market did not seem to be working. He said there was an opportunity to meet this need with the housing company but he was concerned about some of the comments about the company being about housing for sale which would be a missed opportunity.

Councillor Robertson referred to the volunteers and venues supporting the emergency night shelter which was an important service run by volunteers. He hoped there would be no delays to Government funding towards the end of 2020 and that the cold weather would not arrive before the funding.

Councillor Ray supported the core principles of the strategy and said he echoed the comments regarding affordable homes for rent. He questioned when homes would be delivered as part of the Spring housing collaboration.

Councillor Lax noted there had been conveyancing issues and delays due to Covid-10 but efforts were being made to ensure delivery as soon as possible.

Councillor England seconded the recommendations and it was

RESOLVED: (1) That the Housing, Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy 2019-2024 and the accompanying Annexes be approved.

(2) That powers be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Regulatory, Housing and Health in conjunction with the Head of Regulatory Services, Housing and Wellbeing, to amend the strategy and action plan after the year one review to assess the implications of the Covid-19 pandemic and any emerging challenges.

(3) That approval be given to the new policy of earmarking future Right to Buy receipts towards capital investment to support delivery of the Housing, Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy.

93 UPDATE TO THE CONSTITUTION

It was noted that the Council Constitution was constantly reviewed and updated to ensure it remained fit for purpose, reflected changes in legislation, and provided appropriate delegations.

Due to recent staffing changes and findings from a scheme of delegation audit, several changes to the scheme of delegation to officers were recommended.

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

RESOLVED: (1) That the updated scheme of delegation be approved.

(2) That the new Cabinet portfolios be approved.

94 PAY POLICY 2020

Members noted the Council's duty under Section 38 of the Localism Act 2011 to prepare and publish an annual Pay Policy Statement and gave consideration to the updated Pay Policy Statement for 2020.

Councillor Ray said he was glad to see a target for apprenticeships and asked about the plans for meeting the target. Councillor Smith stressed the importance of making use of the apprenticeship Levy and advised that approximately 12 apprenticeships were being progressed at the time. In addition the levy could be used to provide training to existing employees and there was potential for using the levy to help local businesses with their training programmes.

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

RESOLVED: (1) That the contents of the updated Pay Policy Statement be approved

(2) That authority be given to the Head of Governance & Performance in consultation with the Chairman of Employment Committee, to update and republish the pay policy once the national pay negotiations for 2020 are concluded.

95 EXTENSION OF THE SIX MONTH ATTENDANCE RULE

Although verbal notification had been given of Councillor Brown's intention to resign formal notification had yet been received. Therefore the Council proceeded to give consideration to granting Councillor Brown dispensation for non-attendance in accordance with Section 85 of the Local Government Act 1972.

The possibility of participating in meetings by telephone was raised and it was confirmed that this was an option that was offered.

Councillor Robertson supported the delegation of authority to approve dispensations where the reason was related to Covid-19.

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

RESOLVED: (1) That dispensation to the six month rule for non-attendance at meetings be granted to Councillor Brown; and

(2) That the Head of Governance and Performance (Monitoring Officer) , in consultation with the Chairman of the Council, be delegated to approve dispensations to the six month rule when the reason is related to the Covid-19 virus pandemic.

96 REQUEST BY HINTS WITH CANWELL PARISH COUNCIL TO REGULARISE ITS NAME

It was reported that in 1992 a resolution was passed by Hints Parish Council to change its name to 'Hints with Canwell Parish Council'. However there was no record of an Order giving effect to the name change and it is currently referred to as either Hints *and* Canwell Parish Council or Hints *with* Canwell Parish Council.

Therefore the Parish Council has now requested, in accordance with Section 75 of the Local Government Act 1972, that the District Council approves the making of an Order to regularise the name as Hints with Canwell Parish Council.

It was proposed by Councillor Lax, seconded by Councillor B Yeates and

RESOLVED: That the Council give effect to the wishes of the Parish Council by regularising its name as 'Hints with Canwell Parish Council'

97 QUESTIONS

Q1. Question from Councillor Robertson to the Cabinet Member for Visitor Economy and Local Plan:

What progress has the authority made identify a site for the travelling community to use, as is required by law?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Visitor Economy and Local Plan:

As part of the evidence base work undertaken to support the emerging Local Plan review, the Council had a Gypsy and Traveller Assessment undertaken in conjunction with Tamworth and North Warwickshire and this was completed in November 2019.

This identifies the need to provide for an additional 13 pitches between now and 2040 over and above the existing site provision that already exists. This is to provide 4 pitches for maturing teenagers in the next 5 years from households who meet the planning definition of Gypsy & Traveller, who will need their own pitches, as well as 3 to provide for household demographic changes on existing private sites. In addition, it identifies the need to provide 6 further pitches for those who do not meet the planning definition and are identified as coming from being on unauthorised encampments or from new household formation.

Historically there used to be government guidance outlining what a 'pitch' requirement size would look like, however, that has been withdrawn. The guidance also used to look at whether the need was permanent, or, to cater for influxes of transient populations and therefore short-term provision. The current government approach in relation to the 6 pitches, identified for those as coming from being on unauthorised encampments or from new household formation, is for this need to be viewed as part of the general housing numbers, rather than the Gypsy & Traveller Needs Assessment.

The Gypsy and Traveller Assessment indicates there may be opportunities to remodel and make more efficient use of existing private sites by use of touring caravans, day rooms, etc. It may be that a combination of new provision and better use of existing sites will allow us to meet the needs identified for our District. Given that the majority of identified need comes from households living on private sites it is likely that it will need to be addressed through the provision of private pitches or sites.

With regards to transient movement, we will need to consider if as a local authority we wish to make provision for negotiated stopping. If we were to do so it would provide temporary stopping places that can be made available at times of increased demand due to fairs or cultural celebrations that are attended by Gypsies and Travellers. As a local authority we

could levy a charge for this provision in return for providing facilities such as cold-water supply; portaloos; sewage disposal point and refuse disposal facilities.

The intention is to address the issue of adequate provision by early September at the latest, as we will need to ensure this is included in our emerging local plan, given the Planning Inspectorate identified as a serious omission the failure to address this in our current local plan.

Councillor Robinson asked the following supplementary question:

Since having social distancing restrictions in place there have been instances in the City and other parts of the District of unauthorised encampments and I was heartened by the Cabinet Member's response about making temporary stopping places available. I would like to check that the evidence base will include the need to make basic amenities available, the cost of managing unauthorised encampments and the potential for conflict between the settled community and travelling community around unauthorised encampments.

The Cabinet Member responded:

The Cabinet Members confirmed that there was a need to provide six short term spaces and if we wished to make a charge for the use of the site we would need to supply basic facilities and everything would be looked at in an appropriate fashion.

Q2. Question from Councillor Robertson to the Cabinet Member for Community Engagement:

What was the Council's carbon footprint for previous year?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Community Engagement:

The Council does not have a current measurement of its own carbon footprint, so we are working with neighbouring councils across Staffordshire to agree a comparable methodology for measuring this in order to set a baseline from which to progress. The overall *district* emissions using BEIS data from 2017 (the most recent source) was shared with Councillors in December 2019.

Councillor Robinson asked the following supplementary question:

Working towards a net zero economy and future is important and the Council needs to lead on it. I'm concerned that if we are to support the government net zero target that we don't know what our own contribution towards that is. I would like to know if the Cabinet Member has begun any specific actions related to this importance issue and emergency we find ourselves in.

The Cabinet Member responded:

Yes we did start the work and were working with our partners but unfortunately due to Covid-19 that work was stopped but I look forward to continuing and getting the work started again soon.

Q3. Question from Councillor Robertson to the Cabinet Member for Finance, Procurement, Customer Services, Revenues and Benefits:

When will the local procurement policy be brought before Council?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Finance, Procurement, Customer Services, Revenues and Benefits

The overarching Procurement Strategy is in draft form, with an ongoing action plan that places a heavy emphasis on both procuring locally, and on social benefit in our procurement processes. The next stage in the process is to fill the roles in our newly expanded procurement team, for which the applications close on 19th July and where we already have some exciting applicants coming forward. The successful applicants will then help to develop the final strategy which will be presented to the November meeting of the Strategic O&S committee, and subject to Cabinet approval may make December's Council. I had hoped to bring this forward for September however the recruitment process was delayed by the lockdown, which was a regrettable but necessary consequence.

I look forward to working with Cllr Robertson and other members on shaping this important factor in local recovery and improving ties with local business.

Q4. Question from Councillor Robertson to the Cabinet Member for Finance, Procurement, Customer Services, Revenues and Benefits:

How does the cabinet member think that the decision not to borrow to invest in commercial property will affect the ability of the Council to close our funding gap?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Finance, Procurement, Customer Services, Revenues and Benefits

This question is particularly challenging to answer in the current context while we are still unsure how the global pandemic will affect our financial position and how big the funding gap will be when the dust clears.

The decision was the only possible one to take when the government moved to stop Local Authority "debt for yield" schemes where debt was taken on through the Public Works Loan Board to acquire and speculate on built-out development. As our approved Property Investment Strategy relied upon that route, at least in part, it became unsustainable in its current form. In one way I am grateful that the decision was made for us before we had advanced too far, given the risks inherent in investing in what had become a bubble grown with Local Authority debt.

However, there has been no move to stop Local Authorities borrowing to invest in place shaping - borrowing to develop within the District either alone or as part of a joint venture. At present, how feasible or desirable that will be post-Covid-19 is a moot point and will depend very much on demand for the types of development we are able to deliver. I don't think anybody could predict at this stage whether there will be demand for office accommodation in large scale, for instance, given the potential increase in home working.

So in a simple answer to Cllr Robertson, that decision closes one door but does not necessarily hinder our ability to close the funding gap through investment in property. While the current MTFs assumes a contribution from investment in property of £87k in 2020/21 rising to £658k by 2023/24, we have always been very careful with our forecasts and it may well be the case that this contribution can be met from other investment routes.

Q5. Question from Councillor Evans to the Cabinet Member for Regulatory, Housing and Health:

Can Councillor Lax, who is now the Cabinet Member for the effective delivery of DFG's, please tell us the current state of the provision. We were told we would receive regular updates as we know the provider was not doing as well as was anticipated or as they promised at their initial presentation. What are the issues that are causing concern, when is the contract going to be reviewed and what is the reason for considerably fewer grants being awarded since 2013/14, except for 2014/15?

Are the requests increasing and what is the proportion of elderly people requesting help, compared to younger people with physical disabilities?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Regulatory, Housing and Health:

A report detailing performance in 2019/20 was scheduled for the June meeting of CHH O&S which was postponed and a report will now be presented to the next meeting of the committee on 15th September 2020. This report will provide a detailed update on performance over the last financial year and will also update members on progress this year and the impact so far of the Covid 19 pandemic.

Since April 2018 we have been part of the county-wide Supporting Independent Living in Staffordshire (SILIS) Partnership; the current contract is for 5 years and runs until March 2023 with the potential to extend for two further years until end of March 2025. As Cllr Evans knows, the contract was awarded to Millbrook Healthcare Ltd which now operate 6 home improvement agencies across the UK.

There have been issues with the performance of the contract since the start that resulted in the Partnership issuing Millbrook with a Service Improvement Plan in 2019, which was followed by a formal improvement notice. One outcome of has been much better engagement by Millbrook's senior leadership team and a restructuring of the local Millbrook staff team. In April 2020, the 6 districts also appointed an experienced consultant project manager who is providing specialist support to each authority and has enabled positive improvements to continue, despite the challenges of Covid 19.

Although the service provided by Millbrook has improved, particularly the quality of assessments and adaptations, there remain some challenges, particularly the length of time it takes for works to complete and the backlog of cases due to Covid. Whilst Covid has allowed some cases to proceed, the inability of staff or contractors to visit clients, means that there is now a backlog of cases awaiting assessment which is being addressed. The nature of DFG works and the client group mean that extra risk assessments and safeguards are needed to ensure the safety of both clients, staff and contractors. A Covid risk assessment has been developed to ensure clients, staff and contractors remain safe whilst also allowing applications and works to progress where it is safe to do so.

In answer to the question regarding why fewer grants being awarded since 2013/14, except for 2014/15, comparisons over such a long time scale are difficult to compare due to changes in provider and the different types of contract arrangements over this time.

Are the requests increasing and what is the proportion of elderly people requesting help, compared to younger people with physical disabilities?

During Q1 this financial year, Millbrook have received 29 Enquiries for a DFG. The table below compares to the same quarter in previous years:

	2020	2019
April	8	11
May	11	17
June	10	12
Q1 TOTAL	29	40

Figures compared to 2019 are only slightly lower on a month by month basis, which allowing for Covid is not unexpected.

In terms of age of applicant ages – for 2019-20 there were 60 cases where works were completed; of these 38 were for people aged over 60; and 9 were for people aged 18 and

under; the remaining 13 were for those aged between 19 and 59 (based on age at completion of works).

Councillor Evans asked the following supplementary question:

I am aware that the pandemic has altered many things but we have not had a Community, Housing and Health (O&S) Committee and I would like assurance that if at all possible the meeting in September meeting will go ahead since we need an update on the performance of Millbrook since we know it has not been up to standard and we need to look at this and other issues.

The Cabinet Member Responded:

The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled. In my reply I gave details of the improvements that have been put in place with Millbrook and there has been a significant improvement and the latest figures do show this improvement so I look forward to updating Councillor Evans at the meeting in September.

Q6. Question from Councillor Evans to the Cabinet Member for Regulatory, Housing and Health:

It has long been a concern of some members of the Planning Committee that the percentage of affordable homes is not being met and it appears we are pandering to developers. What is Councillor Lax proposing to do about this shortfall as mentioned in the Local Plan and will she ensure that these will be across the District and not merely in Lichfield and Burntwood?

Does she agree that we are failing our young people who may want to remain in the area and does she also accept that unless affordable homes are provided we could well lose workers who may be forced to go elsewhere for employment opportunities?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Regulatory, Housing and Health:

The Council's policy on the delivery of affordable housing requires developments in Lichfield and Burntwood for 15 or more dwellings, or, on sites of 0.5 ha or more in size, for affordable housing to be delivered in line with our current viable level of affordable housing. Our Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) for 2019 sets the current viable level at 37%. Outside these two main urban areas, affordable housing will be required on housing developments in line with nationally set thresholds. It is however important to note that affordable housing contributions can only be sought on those sites which are in line with the thresholds set by national standards and local plan policy.

Policy H2 states that affordable housing may be in the form of social rent, affordable rent, intermediate or a mix of tenures. The Council normally requires at least 65% of the affordable housing on a site to be social rented managed by one of our approved Registered Providers (RPs). The exact percentages will be agreed on a scheme by scheme basis during the determination of the planning application and the Council's housing and wellbeing strategy team will examine available evidence on local housing needs to help determine these. On occasions where an applicant is not willing or unable to provide the percentage of affordable housing required in accordance with our policy, the economic viability of the scheme will be independently tested by the District Valuer.

Across the three years 2016-17 to 2018-19, 398 affordable dwellings were built and occupied of which 58% was delivered via developer contributions secured by s106 agreements and 42% was delivered directly by Registered Providers using their internal own funds and affordable homes funding from Homes England. These were delivered in Lichfield and

Burntwood and a number of our settlements such as Armitage with Handsacre, Alrewas and Fradley, Whittington and Streethay, Colton and the Ridwares, Bourne Vale and Curborough.

In addition to those affordable homes which have been delivered over these three years a significant number of affordable homes have gained planning permission and likely to come through to delivery in the coming years. The most recent AMR details there are a further 213 affordable dwellings permitted to be constructed in the next five years. Whilst this AMR is in the process of being updated further affordable homes have been permitted since the current one was published taking the total submitted supply to in excess of 600 affordable homes awaiting construction.

Full detail of further completions and supply will be set out within the next update to the AMR. The updated AMR, Five year supply paper and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) will be presented to local plan sub-committee in due course. The reason for the delay in data collection has been due to the COVID-19 pandemic restricting the ability for Officers to get out and undertake site visits to confirm completions and starts.

As members will be aware the Local Plan is currently being reviewed and as part of this process work is being undertaken to assess viability across the district. This will help inform planning policy on housing provision and the suitability of allocations to meet identified need. It will also enable an appropriate affordable housing policy to be brought forward. When completed the work will be presented for consideration by the Local Plans sub-committee, part of the EGED Committee. The draft policy, informed by the above will also be presented to members as part of the subsequent draft Local Plan.

I know that my Cabinet colleague Councillor Eadie is encouraging growth of our other settlements beyond Lichfield and Burntwood as part of our emerging local plan review. This is intended to help these settlements be sustainable and also to give the opportunity for people to find homes in our rural settings, not just in Lichfield and Burntwood.

In terms of providing dwellings for key workers and first-time buyers, so that they stay in our District, we welcome the Government's First Home proposals and look forward to these coming forward once Government has reflected on the consultation it recently undertook on these.

Councillor Evans asked the following supplementary question:

I would like reassurance that we will stick to the percentage of affordable housing in future developments. I note that there are 600 affordable homes awaiting development and it is important we stick to the agreed percentage.

The Cabinet Member responded:

Different developments might have different percentages, I understand different sites have different agreements but I'm very cognisant of where we want to go on this and it is part of the development of the local plan to factor this issue in.

Q7. Question from Councillor Ball to the Cabinet Member for Regulatory, Housing & Health:

Although it is very early days for her with her new responsibility for housing, can the Cabinet Member, please, tell us what progress she has made in discussions to have adopted in Lichfield District the definition of affordable rents as promoted by the West Midlands Combined Authority (i.e. rents and mortgages at 35% or less than the average gross earnings of the lowest quarter of wage earners in a local area)?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Regulatory, Housing and Health:

I am aware that the WMCA has introduced its own localised definition of affordable rent, linked to people's income in the area rather than the WMCA property market. This is based on local people paying no more than 35% of their salary on mortgages or rent. LDC is not a member of WMCA and therefore we have not been involved in any discussions around setting such a 'local' definition that may work for this significantly smaller authority.

It is important that the definition of Affordable housing that we adopt in our emerging Local Plan is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). When preparing planning policies we need to have regard to what is 'sound' and would be successful at examination; an essential element is that the definition would need to be consistent with national policy. Any proposed diversion from the definition in the NPPF will need to be evidence based. We cannot just adopt something from the WMCA which is designed for specific funding models linked to its own land acquisition and planning policy.

Councillor Ball asked the following supplementary question:

Does the Cabinet Member agree that the definition of affordability set out in the question represents a more reasonable definition than 80% of market rent that means many people need to take the course of universal credit and housing benefit to meet property costs which is most unreasonable?

The Cabinet Member responded:

I can't answer as to whether it is reasonable as the West Midlands Combined Authority definition is based on a calculation of their data across a large geographical area. We are in comparison a small district council and it isn't necessarily going to work for us. These are early days for the Combined Authority and the comments are noted.

Q8. Question from Councillor Ball to the Leader of the Council:

Will the Leader of the Council, please, tell us whether he will ask that Council Report templates now include the phrasing "Impact on addressing the Climate Change Emergency", rather than "Environmental Impact", and agree to add "Impact on Local Procurement" to future reports?

Response from the Leader of the Council:

The phrase "Environmental Impact" has been decided upon as it includes, amongst other things, our response to the Climate Change Emergency which we declared last year. This is a much wider definition than just climate change, although it necessarily includes it, and in my view is a better way of summarising our intent.

The Local Procurement policy will be a formally adopted policy of the Council, and will therefore be taken into account in all reports, without any need for inclusion on the template.

Councillor Ball asked the following supplementary question:

Will the Leader make sure there is consistency in the future since some reports talk about environmental issues, some about environmental impact and some have no reference at all. Most reports say no impact, we agreed there was a climate emergency and we need to have some action on it and need to see ways we are improving our performance. The reports require consistency.

The Leader responded:

Yes, conversations have already been held with the Chief Executive and we will ensure that rather than focusing on the words in the box we will have a formal and consistent approach across the Council to ensure good governance to ensure the required outcomes.

Q9. Question from Councillor Norman to the Cabinet Member for Visitor Economy and the Local Plan:

Can he confirm that the Planning Department has not had individual representations to the formal consultation on the Local Plan Review held between the 29th of November 2019 and the 24th of January 2020 from the Member of Parliament representing Burntwood or the Member of Parliament representing Mile Oak?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Visitor Economy and the Local Plan:

I can confirm that the Member for the Tamworth parliamentary constituency wrote to our Chief Executive on 21 January 2020 generically on behalf of the residents in Fazeley. He indicated he was not opposed to building and it was his belief that most residents recognised the need for good quality local housing. Mr Pincher asked us to review and give consideration to infrastructure, roads, green spaces and flooding in terms of any development. A response to his letter was provided on 11 February 2020.

I can confirm that the Member for the Lichfield parliamentary constituency wrote to our Chief Executive on 17 February 2020 regarding the concerns of a resident in Hanney Hay Road over a document that had been published by Harworth, relating to a proposal to create a new sustainable neighbourhood at land off Hospital Road. The letter was a follow on from a previous exchange on the same matter during the consultation period on which one of our officers had already provided a response and the resident makes reference to being associated with Burntwood Action Group. A response to Michael Fabricant's letter was provided on 26 February 2020.

Q10. Question from Councillor Norman to the Cabinet Member for Major Projects and Economic Development:

One of my constituents asked me why some of the very large coaches signs painted on the road surface at Lichfield Bus Station appeared to be upside down. I asked about this and after a reminder got the answer: "The tender drawings for the scheme, which the contractor has worked to, does indeed show the road signage to be upside down when viewed from a coach driver's position. This mistake by the architect was not picked up until the contractor had completed the lining."

This was an unfortunate mistake but when I reported back to my constituent they told me that they had in fact drawn this to the attention of the contractors when he saw them working there and was told that the Contractor had queried the signage before starting work and was told that the 'Planning Department' said that was how they wanted it.

Can he confirm that the Contractor did indeed query this with the Council as my constituent was told?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Major Projects and Economic Development:

Yes it was queried; it depends on where you stand whether it is upside down or not.

Councillor Norman asked the following supplementary question:

The signs are about 10 metres by 2 metres which is quite large and coach drivers drive sitting down not standing up, and I would ask if she is not surprised at least one Member from Hammerwich with Wall, voted against the Masterplan for which she is responsible?

The Cabinet Member responded:

It does in fact depend on whether you stand up. If you are kerbside you can read the signs if you are driving unfortunately you can't. We sought guidance from the architect on this and were advised either way was appropriate. We are in talks with the contractor and will decide whether to change the signs around.

Q11. Question from Councillor Norman to the Cabinet Member for Regulatory, Housing & Health:

Can she confirm that all members of the Planning Committee have attended training sessions to enable them to carry out their duties when considering Planning Applications despite evidence to the contrary as seen in the recording of the virtual Planning Committee Meeting held on the 1st of June 2020?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Regulatory, Housing & Health:

Regular Member training sessions take place. Generally four per year are set within the calendar on different planning topic areas. Before members join the Planning Committee they receive training on the planning system also, last undertaken when the composition of the Planning Committee changed. (May 2019- a session on an introduction to Development Management presented by our Planning Development Manager and Ashley Baldwin/the then Spatial Policy & Delivery Manager provided an introduction to his area of planning).

In addition, in the last 12 months, training has taken place for members on probity and predisposition (more than one session, including one presented by a Planning Solicitor, then our Monitoring Officer did another follow up session (Dec 2019)), and of course we had the recent virtual planning enforcement training session 21st May 2020 for all members who were able to attend.

Councillor Norman asked the following supplementary question:

Is the Cabinet Member happy that it took twenty minutes for the Chairman of the Planning Committee on 1 June to get Members to declare interests and took an hour and ten minutes to decide on a planning application that was actually permitted development and Members appeared to think the longer they lived in the ward the more expert advice they had over and above that of the Highways Officer who is professional. I think there does need to be more training?

The Cabinet Member responded:

Regarding Councillor Norman's comments about the way the meeting was conducted, I thank him for that. It is a difficult one, I would ask him in true honesty if at times he thinks he knows more about his Ward than those at the County Council and Highways. We have supplied the training, it was a virtual meeting, as Councillor Marshall has said, onwards and upwards.

Q12. Question from Councillor Norman to the Cabinet Member for Regulatory, Housing & Health:

Can she also confirm that where there is a possible breach of planning regulations planning enforcement officers can, and I quote, “invite an application or seek resolution without taking enforcement action”?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Regulatory, Housing & Health:

How we approach Planning Enforcement is set out in the adopted LDC Local Enforcement Plan which is on our website. Also, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, enforcement action is discretionary and it states all LPAs should act proportionately in responding to suspected breaches. Our Local Enforcement Plan follows these national guidelines.

Paragraphs 4.9 & 4.10 of the Enforcement Plan set out that:

- “4.9 In cases where there may be a technical breach of planning control but the harm caused is insufficient to warrant formal action, we will notify the complainant of the reason for not taking formal action and close the case;*
- 4.10 Negotiate with those responsible for any breach of planning control, allowing them the opportunity to resolve the matters of concern before serving a formal notice, unless the breach is so serious it warrants immediate action or where negotiations become protracted with no real likelihood of success.”*

Operational experience shows that taking formal enforcement action/serving Notices is not always the best or most effective way to resolve more minor issues. If it becomes necessary and proportionate to take enforcement action, before incurring costs, our rate payers would expect us to have tried to address the harm arising. That is the sensible approach to take. We do however look to prioritise cases- as set out in section 6 of the Enforcement Plan. If there is a serious breach then we will take enforcement action.

Councillor Norman asked the following supplementary question:

Referring to the last paragraph in the detailed reply I agree with the statement that ‘Operational experience shows that taking formal enforcement action/serving notices is not always the best or most effective way to resolve more minor issues.’ The application discussed on 1 June that took one hour and ten minutes was about a fence that had permitted planning development rights. This was obvious to anyone who had served on Planning Committee, I would like to ask if the Cabinet Member would support my request for the residents of 31 Yew Tree Avenue to have their money refunded for an application they did not need to submit if the Officer had taken five minutes to talk with the Highways Officer about whether an application was needed or not?

The Cabinet Member responded:

I don’t propose to have an inquest into a matter that has now been resolved.

Q.13 Question from Councillor Ho to the Cabinet Member for Community Engagement:

After reading Cllr Robertson’s comments on twitter can you tell me what involvement he had with the Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Community Engagement:

Cllr Robertson had no involvement. I checked with our officers and they confirmed he has had no contact with them or been on CHH Overview and Scrutiny.

I can only presume he was trying to congratulate the officers and me on the great work we have done.

Q.14 Question from Councillor Baker to the Cabinet Member for Regulatory, Housing & Health:

We do not want anyone rough sleeping, particularly during this pandemic. Can the Cabinet Member for Regulatory, Housing and Health confirm that all rough sleepers in the district have been offered accommodation?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Regulatory, Housing & Health:

All the rough sleepers that either ourselves or Spring, our outreach service for rough sleepers, have engaged with have been offered accommodation. We have had a few reports of rough sleepers where we have visited the sites and either seen no evidence of rough sleeping or seen evidence but no rough sleepers. Where there is evidence, Spring leave contact details. They also do follow up visits, even to sites where there is no evidence and speak to either those who reported seeing the rough sleeper or residents/business owners who live or work nearby and leave contact details with them too. We will continue to offer accommodation to all rough sleepers who choose to engage with us.

This was the situation at the start of the pandemic and continues to be the case. Going forward the initiative with Spring is to focus on getting rough sleepers into permanent accommodation where they feel safe and have appropriate and skilled support. Underpinning our strategy is very much LDC taking a long term approach on rough sleeping to achieve better outcomes.

Councillor Baker asked the following supplementary question:

I would like to get a better idea about the number of rough sleepers who are failing to engage with us and what if anything we can do about that?

The Cabinet Member responded:

Part of our partnering with Spring who are specialists in providing outreach, not only do we engage but we leave notes on visited sites and use a very proactive approach and that will continue. If rough sleepers choose to engage with us, sadly not all do, we will be able to offer them accommodation. The figures are provided to us weekly and we currently have one who chooses not to engage but that doesn't mean we give up on them and that is important as we move out of the pandemic and later in the year as we prepare for periods of bad weather.

Q15. Question from Councillor Baker to the Cabinet Member for Leisure, Parks and Waste:

We know that, nationally, bin collections have been thrown into disarray due to Covid 19 - Would the Cabinet member advise us how many, and where, bin collections were missed since "lock down" throughout the Lichfield District?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Leisure, Parks and Waste:

During lockdown, our Joint Waste Service has performed superbly and is a source of great pride to the Council. We are one of less than 10% of authorities that have retained a complete service, collecting residual waste, recycling, garden waste and bulky waste throughout the lockdown period, even managing to continue to deliver new bins.

In the period March to June there were missed 1,632 bins, compared to 1,338 in the same period in 2019. We of course strive to miss no bins and it's important to stress that we return to collect all reported missed bins within three working days. However this still represents the successful collection of 99.9% of all bins first-time and is a remarkable achievement given so many people were at home with more bins presented and waste volumes increased by up to 40%. I would like to congratulate the team and thank them for their work during these unprecedented and difficult times.

Councillor Baker asked the following supplementary question:

I'm really pleased to see the figures, well done the Operational Services team, particularly when the green tags were put on the black bins as well which was done speedily and went down well with residents. Were there any pockets where we missed bins?

The Cabinet Member responded:

I am not aware of any individual pockets or problems.

Q16. Question from Councillor Baker to the Cabinet Member for Major Projects and Economic Development:

The Lichfield District officers have been very diligent and worked extremely hard disseminating grants to business in a timely manner but I would ask the Cabinet member if he could summarise the numbers and types of businesses awarded grants and highlight those businesses that have unfortunately not been able to access grants?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Major Projects and Economic Development:

The Small Business Grant and Retail, Hospitality and Leisure Grant Schemes has been paid to 1,494 businesses, to the value of £18,120,000 (as of 10th July 2020), which is around 93% of the number of eligible businesses (1,604) identified at the start of the process. These grants were for the rate payer of eligible commercial properties trading on the 11th March 2020 and either received small business rate relief; or had a rateable value of between £15,001 to £51,000 and were within the retail, hospitality or leisure sector.

In terms of the discretionary grant aimed at small businesses who were not eligible for the two original grants, 64 grants have been awarded totalling £320,000. Four business types were outlined within the national guidance to prioritise: small businesses in shared offices or flexible workspaces, regular market traders with fixed building costs, B&Bs that pay council tax and certain charity properties in receipt of charitable business rates relief, all of whom must have suffered a significant loss of income due to covid 19 and have high ongoing fixed commercial property related costs.

The businesses who unfortunately are not able to access these grants administered by the local authorities:

- Homeworkers (with no fixed commercial premises)
- Businesses with a rateable value greater than £51,000
- None rate payers in a sole office, industrial or retail unit
- Businesses who aren't within the retail, hospitality or leisure sector with a rateable value of between £15,001 to £51,000.

Councillor Baker asked the following supplementary question:

We know we have done well in terms of providing grants, rates holidays etc. but I am aware of a number of businesses that fall outside the financial support network partly as a consequence of policy and partly because we are learning as Covid progresses how different businesses are affected, but I was wondering if we ought to be considering how we can identify and help support those businesses that are falling through the net and aren't currently provided for. I personally have received requests from businesses and wonder if we can look at the situation more strategically.

The Cabinet Member responded:

We recognise that there are certain areas that have not been able to get funding from the government hence we changed the discretionary grant criteria. Unfortunately we were not able to tweak the criteria for the first round of funding. We have been signposting businesses that are not eligible to the LEPs, County Council funding streams and any other appropriate sources. More businesses are eligible for the amended discretionary grant scheme. We are aware some businesses are falling through the gap and we are doing everything we can to provide support.

Q17. Question from Councillor Gwilt to the Cabinet Member for Visitor Economy and Local Plan:

Our District has a lot of visitors each year to the likes of the Cathedral, the food festival, Drayton Manor and the National Memorial Arboretum. What are we doing to get Government to give the help that is needed to get the visitors back that so many places and businesses are reliant on?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Visitor Economy and Local Plan:

Lichfield District Council participates in Lichfield Place Board along with Lichfield Cathedral, the National Memorial Arboretum, Drayton Manor Park, Webb Hotel Group, Swinfen Hall Hotel, Three Spires Shopping Centre, Lichfield Garrick, The Hub at St Marys, Lichfield BID, Lichfield Festival and representatives of the three tiers of local government.

On behalf of this collaborative group I have asked our MP Michael Fabricant to lobby Ministers on a number of occasions on issues such as the Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme that has been supporting those who have been unable to operate in the visitor economy since lockdown began. Michael has done so and responses have been received from Government. It has been welcome to see that the issues we have asked Government to respond to have been acted upon.

Visit Britain and Visit England have launched a free 'We're Good To Go' UK-wide industry standard and consumer mark to reassure visitors that businesses, attractions and destinations are safe to visit and that they are adhering to Government and public health guidance.

Michael Fabricant has agreed to join me on Friday 17 July to help raise awareness of a number of places and businesses in the District that have attained the 'We're Good To Go' mark. This will build upon the recent visit of Sir Patrick McLoughlin, chairman of the British Tourist Authority, who visited Drayton Manor to recognise it as one of the first businesses in the country to gain the 'We're Good To Go' industry standard.

Members will be aware that our MP also asked a question of the Prime Minister last week relating to the recent announcement on funding for theatres and the arts, seeking reassurance that our District will receive a fair share of the Government support. The Prime Minister responded this was being looked at with Arts Council England.

I welcome the Secretary for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport announcement on 9 July. This announcement by Government will help outdoor performances to get underway, whilst pilots are undertaken for indoor performances. This will be welcome news for our visitor attractions, as is the Chancellors support for our visitor economy with the reduction in VAT to 5% on food and non-alcoholic drinks served in restaurants, pubs, cafes and takeaways; as well as on accommodation and attractions until January 2021.

The Chancellor's "Eat out to help out" scheme offering a 50% discount for every diner, up to £10 a head, from Monday to Wednesday throughout August also indicates to me Government is giving help that is needed to get the visitors back that so many places and businesses are reliant on.

98 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.

IN PRIVATE

99 CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES OF LEISURE, PARKS & WASTE MANAGEMENT (OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY) COMMITTEE - 3 MARCH 2020

Councillor Matthews submitted the confidential Minutes of the Leisure, Parks and Waste Management (Overview & Scrutiny) Committee held on 3 March 2020.

(The Meeting closed at 8.00 pm)

CHAIRMAN