



The Old Mining College Centre
Queen Street
Chasetown
BURNTWOOD WS7 4QH

Tel: 01543 677166
Email: steve.lightfoot@burntwood-tc.gov.uk
www.burntwood-tc.gov.uk

Our Ref: SL/JM

13 July 2022

To: All Members of the Town Council

Dear Councillor

You are hereby summoned to attend a Meeting of the Town Council to be held in the **Main Hall, Burntwood Memorial Institute, Rugeley Road, Burntwood on Wednesday 20 July 2022 commencing at 6:00 pm** at which the business set out below will be transacted.

Yours sincerely

Steve Lightfoot
Town Clerk

PUBLIC FORUM

As part of the Better Burntwood Concept and to promote community engagement, the public now has the opportunity to attend and speak at all of the Town Council's meetings. Please refer to the end of the agenda for details of how to participate in this meeting.

AGENDA

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

To receive declarations of interests and consider requests for dispensations.

3. MINUTES

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the Meeting of the Town Council held on 11 May 2022 [Minute No. 1-16] be received and where necessary approved and adopted [**ENCLOSURE NO. 1**].

4. CHAIR'S REPORT

For information purposes only. No decision is required by the Council.

5. MEMBERS QUESTIONS

6. RISK ASSESSMENT REGISTER

To review and note the Town Council's Risk Assessment Register. This is a document to summarise the Town Council's current risk. Members are asked to note that the Risk Assessment and Management [Financial] Plan was approved by the Town Council in November 2021 [**ENCLOSURE NO. 2**].

7. BURNTWOOD LIONS

The Council is asked to agree to fund the Burntwood Lions White Goods Scheme with up to £3,000 before further review and that the Policy and Resources Committee scrutinises the scheme's details and suggest any improvements and efficiencies [**ENCLOSURE NO. 3**].

8. COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW

Members are asked to comment on the review [**ENCLOSURE NO. 4, APPENDIX A AND B**]

9. TOWN DEAL PARTNERSHIP

The Leader to give a verbal update on issues being pursued via the Town Deal Partnership.

10. PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE – 12 MAY, 14 JUNE AND 11 JULY 2022

Chair of the Planning and Development Committee to move that the proceedings of the meetings held on 12 May 2022 [Minute Nos 1- 7], 14 June 2022 [Minute Nos 8 - 13] and 11 July 2022 [Minute Nos. 14 - 18] be received and where necessary approved and adopted [**ENCLOSURE NO. 5A, 5B AND 5C**].

11. POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE – 08 JUNE 2022

Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee to move that the proceedings of the meetings held on 08 June 2022 [Minute Nos 1- 14] be received and where necessary approved and adopted [**ENCLOSURE NO. 6**].

12. COMMUNITY AND PARTNERSHIPS COMMITTEE – 22 JUNE 2022

Chair of the Community and Partnerships Committee to move that the proceedings of the meetings held on 22 June 2022 [Minute Nos 1- 15] be received and where necessary approved and adopted [**ENCLOSURE NO. 7**].

13. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED That under the Public Bodies [Admissions of Meeting] Act 1960 [Section 2] [and as expended by Section 100 of the Local Government Act 1972], the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information.

14. POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE – 08 JUNE 2022

Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee to move that the proceedings of the meetings held on 08 June 2022 [Confidential Minute Nos 8 - 14] be received and where necessary approved and adopted [**ENCLOSURE NO. 8 - PINK**].

PUBLIC FORUM

30 minutes will be set aside at the beginning of this meeting for you to raise issues relevant to the remit of the meeting. You will have up to 3 minutes and can raise more than one issue. However, the Chair has the option to extend the time allowed to you if they think it is appropriate.

So that the Members of the meeting can be properly briefed in order to enable them to provide a considered response to your question, please advise the Town Clerk of the question[s] you wish to ask the Council at least three working days before the meeting. The Chair of the meeting has the right to reject any representations that he/she considers not to be appropriate for the meeting.

The public forum session will usually be the first item on the agenda and normally will last up to 30 minutes. In some instances, it may not be possible at the meeting to provide an answer. Where that is the case a written response will be sent to your stated address and a copy will be made available for public inspection at the Town Council's offices.

While audio and video recordings of this meeting are entirely legal, as a matter of courtesy to Town Council members who work for this town and this Council on a voluntary basis, we would be grateful if you would let the Clerk or the Chair know beforehand.
--

**MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL MEETING OF BURNTWOOD TOWN COUNCIL
HELD AT BURNTWOOD MEMORIAL INSTITUTE, RUGELEY ROAD, BURNTWOOD ON
WEDNESDAY 11 MAY 2022 COMMENCING AT 6.13 PM**

PRESENT

Councillor Evans [in the Chair]

Councillors Banevicius, Birch, Bishop, Bullock, Coe, D Ennis, L Ennis, Flanagan, Kirkham, Norman, R Place, Tapper, Taylor, Westwood, Willis-Croft and Woodward

In attendance

S Lightfoot, Town Clerk

Ms J Minor, Deputy Clerk

Ms A James, Finance Officer

County Councillor Wilcox

County Councillor Cox

PUBLIC FORUM

No questions were raised by members of the public.

1. ELECTION OF TOWN COUNCIL CHAIR FOR THE ENSUING YEAR FOLLOWED BY DECLARATION OF ACCEPTANCE OF OFFICE

It was proposed by Councillor Evans, seconded by Councillor Woodward, and following a unanimous show of hands it was

RESOLVED That Councillor Robert Birch be elected Chair of the Town Council for the ensuing year.

Councillor Birch made and signed the Declaration of Acceptance of Office.

2. ELECTION OF TOWN COUNCIL VICE-CHAIR FOR THE ENSUING YEAR FOLLOWED BY DECLARATION OF ACCEPTANCE OF OFFICE

It was proposed by Councillor D Ennis, seconded by Councillor Norman, and following a unanimous show of hands it was

RESOLVED That Councillor Diane Evans be elected Vice-Chair of the Town Council for the ensuing year.

Councillor Evans made and signed the Declaration of Acceptance of Office.

3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

3.1 Councillors Brown, Gittings, Greensill, Ho and M Place.

3.2 RESOLVED That Members formally received and approved Councillor Brown's request that he be granted a Leave of Absence from attendance at meetings from 11 May 2022 until 31 August 2022.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND DISPENSATIONS

Councillor Flanagan declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to Item 72 of the Community and Partnerships Committee Meeting Minutes of 19 April 2022, whereby his wife is founder of the Burntwood Community Seed Share Group and he is an administrator of their Facebook page.

5. MINUTES

Councillor Flanagan asked if Councillor Coe's name could be added to the In Attendance list as she was present from the start of the meeting.

In respect of Minute No. 111 – Update on Income and Expenditure Compared to Budget and Earmarking of Reserves at Year End, Members were asked by the Finance Officer to amend the Minute. It was proposed by Councillor Woodward, seconded by Councillor R Place, and following a unanimous show of hands it was amended to:

The Finance Officer explained that the earmarked reserves should be earmarked for specific projects. On reflection, she suggested that the proposed additions to the earmarked reserves from unspent budget for 2021/22 for Town Strategy [currently £20,984], Bus Shelters [£4,120], Street Lighting [£970] and Public Conveniences [£14,000] could instead go into general reserves at the end of the financial year.

..... rest of the minute as before until:

RESOLVED That the Budget Statement be endorsed and that earmarking be carried out as proposed in the table, except that the additions for Town Strategy, Bus Shelters, Street Lighting and Public Conveniences would not be made.

It was proposed by Councillor Woodward, seconded by Councillor D Ennis, and following a unanimous show of hands it was

RESOLVED That the Minutes of the Meeting of the Town Council held on 16 March 2022 [Minute Nos. 103-120] be received and where necessary approved and adopted subject to the amendment made to Minute No. 111.

6. TO APPOINT CHAIR/VICE-CHAIR AND MEMBERS OF COMMITTEES

It was proposed by Councillor Woodward, seconded by Councillor D Ennis, and following a unanimous show of hands it was

RESOLVED That the revised Appointments to Council and Committees for 2022/23 as circulated be approved.

7. CHAIR'S REPORT

Councillor Birch read out the following statement:

We have an interesting and contrasting year ahead of us as we move out of the pandemic and back into what most of us would call normality. We also have the Jubilee Celebrations to look forward to in a few weeks, which will be a time of both reflection and celebration. I am sure we are all looking forward to the long bank

holiday weekend and hopefully you will be able to join us at the Wakes Jubilee Celebrations we have planned.

In contrast to that we are all concerned about the increases in the cost of living and as a Council we may be called on by the people of Burntwood to help and advise them as they work their way through a difficult year financially. With increasing hardships come increases in mental ill health and I am sure we will be doing all we can to help those in need.

Mental health is a particular concern of mine having seen too many times what the ultimate cost can be as a result of my work over the last 20 years. For this reason I have decided to support Papyrus as the Chairpersons charity this year.

Papyrus works to prevent suicide in young people by raising awareness of mental health issues in young people and offering support. This may seem to be an uncomfortable subject to discuss but that in itself is why it is essential to talk more and raise awareness. Suicide is the biggest cause of death in under 35's in the UK and over 200 school children a year lose their lives to suicide in this country. These deaths are preventable with the right support, so I would like us to be a part of that support in Burntwood.

I would like to thank our outgoing Chair Councillor Diane Evans for the help and support she has given myself as Vice-Chair for the last 3 years. She has been a constant source of advice and guidance for myself and she is someone who always underestimates the impact of her contribution to our town over the years.

When Councillor Evans became Chair she committed to supporting dementia issues and between herself and others on this Council and in the community she had led with Councillor Woodward to attaining Dementia Friendly Accreditation for our town. This benefits our local community, local businesses and those suffering from it and caring for people with dementia. This accreditation is an achievement for us all to be proud of.

As a Chairperson you get invited to many events throughout the year. I will be continuing with the example set by Councillor Evans and only be attending those events that support the people in our town, its businesses and our community as a whole.

Finally, I look forward to working with all Councillors and staff over the next year. One thing that has struck me about my time on Burntwood Town Council is the spirit of co-operation and enthusiasm I have seen between Councillors of all parties and the community groups and partner agencies that have influence in our community. I will do all I can to ensure we can make further progress towards a Better Burntwood and I am sure we will all work together to achieve this.

8. MEMBERS QUESTIONS

No Members questions were raised.

9. APPROVAL OF PAYMENTS FROM 24 MARCH TO 29 APRIL 2022

It was proposed by Councillor Woodward, seconded by Councillor D Ennis, and following a unanimous show of hands it was

RESOLVED That the payments from 24 March to 29 April 2022 in the sum of £38,357.95 be approved.

10. STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS AND ANNUAL GOVERNANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY RETURN FOR FINANCIAL YEAR 2021/22

Members were asked by the Finance Officer to amend the recommendation in her report [the recommendation numbered as 6.1.1 as the 3rd recommendation rather than the 1st]. This is because the Annual Government Statement should be considered and approved before the Accounting Statements. This is reflected in their order in the AGAR.

Councillor Flanagan referred to Enclosure No. 6 [Annual Internal Audit Report 2021/22] and in particular H. Asset and Investments Registers were complete and accurate and properly maintained. Considering the Internal Auditor's comments, the Town Council should combine the two registers.

It was proposed by Councillor Woodward, seconded by Councillor D Ennis, and following a unanimous show of hands it was

RESOLVED That

a. the comments of the Internal Auditor be noted and agree the urgent compilation of an updated and comprehensive overarching risk assessment document for consideration at a subsequent meeting.

b. the Annual Governance Statement with suggested answers of 'No' for question 5 and 'Yes' for other boxes be completed and approve its signature by the Chair and the Town Clerk.

c. the Income and Expenditure and Balance Sheet reports for 2021/22 be approved and that the Chair signs the Accounting Statements in the AGAR.

11. PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE – 15 MARCH 2022 AND 13 APRIL 2022

It was proposed by Councillor Flanagan, seconded by Councillor Banevicius, and following a unanimous show of hands it was

RESOLVED That the Minutes of the Meetings of the Planning and Development Committee held on 15 March 2022 [Minute Nos. 42-46] and 13 April 2022 [Minute Nos. 47-52] be approved as a correct record.

12. COMMUNITY AND PARTNERSHIPS COMMITTEE – 22 MARCH 2022 AND 19 APRIL 2022

It was proposed by Councillor Taylor, seconded by Councillor D Ennis, and following a unanimous show of hands it was

RESOLVED That the Minutes of the Meetings of the Community and Partnerships Committee held on 22 March 2022 [Minute Nos. 56-64] and 19 April 2022 [Minute Nos. 65-74] be approved as a correct record.

13. POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE – 29 MARCH 2022

It was proposed by Councillor Norman, seconded by Councillor Westwood, and following a unanimous show of hands it was

RESOLVED That the Minutes of the Meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee held on 29 March 2022 [Minute Nos. 20-27] be approved as a correct record.

Councillor R Place advised Members that he was stepping down as
Leader of the Conservative Group

14. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED That under the Public Bodies [Admissions of Meeting] Act 1960 [Section 2] [and as expended by Section 100 of the Local Government Act 1972], the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information.

15. CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES

Councillor Woodward referred to Minute No. 119 – Town Deal and asked if third paragraph could be removed from the Confidential Minutes. She confirmed that a meeting had taken place earlier in the day with Councillors and Officers from Burntwood Town Council, Lichfield District Council and Staffordshire County Council on investment opportunities in Burntwood.

It was proposed by Councillor Woodward, seconded by Councillor D Ennis, and following a unanimous show of hands it was

RESOLVED That the Minutes of the Confidential Meeting of the Town Council held on 16 March 2022 [Minute Nos. 118-120] be received and where necessary approved and adopted.

16. POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE – 29 MARCH 2022

It was proposed by Councillor Norman, seconded by Councillor Westwood, and following a unanimous show of hands it was

RESOLVED That the Minutes of the Confidential Meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee held on 29 March 2022 [Minute Nos. 25-27] be approved as a correct record.

[The Meeting closed at 6.56 pm]

Signed

Date

Burntwood Town Council Risk Assessment Register

		Impact			
		Negligible (1)	Low (2)	Medium (3)	High (4)
Likelihood	High (4)	4	8	12	16
	Medium (3)	3	6	9	12
	Low (2)	2	4	6	8
	Negligible (1)	1	2	3	4

Date Created	Date Adopted	Date last reviewed	Date for next review
June 2022	20 July 2022	July 2022	July 2023.

1. ORGANISATION

Reference	Risk	Probability	Impact	Policy	Owner	Frequency of Review
1.1	Loss of Town Clerk (Responsible Officer)	Low (2)	Medium (3)	Continuity through Deputy Clerk. Arrange a Locum Town Clerk (SPCA for advice) Town Clerk's email account available to Deputy.	Chair	Twice annually. May & October
1.2	Loss of RFO	Low (2)	Medium (3)	Maintain up to date record. Locum support via SPCA	Chair Town Clerk	Twice annually. May & October
1.3	Loss of IT data	Low (2)	High (4)	Date Back Up in safe on hard drive daily. Work with IT suppliers to identify risks. Undertake training to spot threats	Town Clerk	Quarterly
1.4	Lone Working	Low (2)	Medium (3)	Policy adopted Ensure staff are aware of safety and their surroundings.	Town Clerk	Annually
1.5	Loss of a Councillor	Medium (2)	Low (2)	Guide to filling a casual vacancy in Standing Orders. Notify LDC.	Town Clerk	Annually (May)

1.6	Pandemic. Global health crisis (eg Covid 19)	Medium (2)	Medium (2)	Ensure good communication is cascaded. Review working from home issues. Check suitable IT equipment is available.	Town Clerk	Annually (May)
-----	---	------------	------------	---	------------	----------------

2. PLANNING

Reference	Risk	Probability	Impact	Policy	Owner	Frequency of Review
2.1	Statutory /LDC Plans and Frameworks not met	Medium	Low	Maintain upto date references. Seek training where required	Council. Town Clerk	Annual
2.2	Town appearance, aesthetics etc. Neighbourhood impact degenerated.	Medium	High	Maintain awareness of local environmental and infrastructure issues. Keep list of town assets and maintenance schedules up to date. Work with and report to other authorities.	Council. Town Clerk	Six Months.
2.3	Conflict with other authorities	Medium	Medium	Gather evidence and data to promote transparency. Regularly meet and liase (eg. Burntwood Town Deal) Involve other authorities at early stage.	Council. Town Clerk	Six Months

2.4	Enforcement	Medium (3)	Medium (3)	Gather evidence and report appropriately.	Members. Town Clerk	Six Months
-----	-------------	------------	------------	---	------------------------	------------

3. COMMUNITY SPACE & PARTNERSHIPS

Reference	Risk	Probability	Impact	Policy	Owner	Frequency of Review
3.1	BTC infrastructure. Welcome Signs, Defib boxes, planters, bus shelters. – damaged or dirty	Low	Low	Inspect regularly. Take appropriate and timely action to repair or maintain	Town Clerk	Quarterly
3.2	Deterioration of other areas; litter, fly tipping, dog mess etc.	Medium	Medium	Support and work with local community organisations. Use grant schemes to help build capacity. Liaise with partners, collaborate with other authorities	Town Clerk	Quarterly
3.3	Community Capacity, volunteers diminishing.	Medium	Medium	Maintain good contacts and communications with voluntary organisations. Support through grants, signposting. Offer visits from Chair to encourage.	Chair. Council. Town Clerk	Quarterly

4. DEMOCRACY

Reference	Risk	Probability	Impact	Policy	Owner	Frequency of Review
4.1	Compliance with Code of Conduct	Low	High	Signed acceptance of office to ensure members abide by the Code of Conduct. Annual Review of Register of Members interest	Council. Town Clerk	May, October
4.2	Deficient Standing Orders	Low	Low	Standing Orders reviewed by Policy & Performance Committee annually. Clerk review quarterly and advise full council of any changing circumstances or potential issues that have arisen	Council. P&R Committee. Town Clerk	Annual
4.3	Inaccurate Minutes	Low	Medium	Drafts sent to Clerk and then Chair. Reviewed and approved at meeting	Chairs of Council & Committees Town Clerk	Six Month
4.4	Loss of Minutes	Low	Medium	Electronic backup daily	Town Clerk	Six Months
4.5	Image and Reputation of Council	Medium	High	Ensure social media and website content is appealing and up to date. Engage with community groups regularly. Undertake annual survey to help understand levels of satisfaction.	Council. Town Clerk	Annual

5. OLD MINING COLLEGE AND CEMETARY

Specific Risk Assessment Held on File

Reference	Risk	Probability	Impact	Policy	Owner	Frequency of Review
5.1	Health, Safety and Wellbeing	Low	Medium	Specific day to day risk assessments are in place. First Aid kits checked regularly. List of qualified First Aiders maintained.	Town Clerk	Monthly
5.2	Excessive costs for maintenance, utilities etc	Medium	Medium	Monitor costs, and seek best value.	Town Clerk	Annually
5.3	Vacant Units at OMC	Medium	Low	Use networks to promote business use of OMC	Town Clerk	Annually
5.4	Fire, burglary at OMC	Low	High	Alarm and maintenance and insurance contracts in place. Fire Marshal appointed. Regular drills and information available for staff and tenants.	Town Clerk.	Annually

6. COMMUNITY EVENTS

Specific Risk Assessments on file and review before each event.

Reference	Risk	Probability	Impact	Policy	Owner	Frequency of Review
6.1	Health, Safety Wellbeing	Low	Medium	Specific risks are assessed for each event and are held on file, and used to brief staff. A dynamic risk assessment is completed on the day to take into account factors such as weather	Town Clerk. Events Manager	Annual

6.2	Reputation. Expectation management	Low	Medium	Good clear communications on all available channels. Cost effective and review publicity.	Town Clerk	Quarterly
-----	--	-----	--------	--	---------------	-----------

Burntwood Town Council

20 July 2022

Burntwood Lions Funding

Purpose of Report

For Members to consider future funding and arrangements to support the Burntwood Lions "White Good Scheme"

Burntwood Town Council has an established partnership with Burntwood Lions to deliver essential "white goods" (washing machine, fridge, etc) to vulnerable residents at risk of severe hardship.

1. Applications for support with white goods are channelled to Burntwood Lions via Social Services, housing association support officers (usually Bromford), churches and local community organisations (such as Spark). This acts as a filter to ensure that Lions are supported to work with people in genuine need.
2. The white goods items are all purchased from Hathaways of Chasetown who supply new items that are "graded" (i.e – some superficial damage, but in full working order and with warranty), which ensures a saving over RRP. The Lions report that they get an excellent service from Hathaways who offer support with fitting and with disposal of old units.
3. The Lions note that each case is different, but they have developed a consistent approach to assess each one. A small Lions team visit each applicant with a worker from the referring organisation, to determine what equipment is required, size, and fitting etc. The Lions are concerned that there appears to have been a significant rise in need as a result of domestic abuse which results in mothers with children needing help and having had to leave home with no possessions.
4. Using their own funds, The Lions are usually able to supply a food voucher to ensure that families have good start and can avoid going into debt for essential. However, they are concerned that, as a loss of fundraising opportunities during Covid pandemic, that this is no long sustainable.
5. It is widely recognised that the County is in a cost-of-living crisis, as inflation rises (particularly for basic essential food items), and heating and electricity costs rise significantly. The worst consequences are likely to fall on our most vulnerable residents. This scheme provides a quick and flexible, non-bureaucratic respond to some desperate need.
6. The Lion's Treasurer has reported that in this current financial year (July 21-June 22) they have spent £3,651 for 16 cases, an average of £228.00 per family. Purchases are for cookers, fridge/freezers and washing machines.

Recommendations

1. That the Council agree to fund the Burntwood Lions White Goods Scheme with up to £3,000 before further review.
2. That Policy and Resources Committee scrutinises the scheme's details and suggest any improvements and efficiencies.

Contact Officer

Steve Lightfoot

Town Clerk

steve.lightfoot@burntwood-tc.gov.uk

01543 677166

Burntwood Town Council

20 July 2022

Community Governance Review

1. The Review was announced in September 2019 but put on hold because of the disruption to normal working caused by Covid 19. The aim of the review is to give the community an opportunity to consider the appropriateness of the existing administrative boundaries within the district. The review will be undertaken by Lichfield District Council (LDC).
2. On 14 December 2021 Lichfield District Council resolved to undertake a review of the whole District. Terms of Reference were published on 1 February and a consultation exercise took place between 1 February - 25 April 2022.
3. A community governance review can consider:
 - creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes
 - naming of parishes and determining the style of new parishes
 - electoral arrangements for parishes e.g. the year of election, council size (the number of councillors) and parish warding
 - grouping parishes under a common parish council or de-grouping parishes
 - other types of local arrangements, including parish meetings
4. A community governance review is required to take into account:
 - The impact of community governance arrangements on community cohesion; and
 - The size, population and boundaries of a local community or parish
 - The council is required to ensure that community governance within the area under review will:
 - i. Be reflective of the identities and interests of the community in that area; and
 - ii. Be effective and convenient
 - iii. Complete terms of reference can be found on Lichfield District Council's Website here - <https://www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/community/community-governance-review-terms-reference>
5. A total of 98 submissions and a 67 signature petition were received. There were two submissions regarding Burntwood (See Appendix A and B) and no recommendations have been made at this stage.
6. There are various issues in Burntwood that the CGR could address, and submit to LDC in the next phase of the Consultation.
 - Boundaries drawn between eg Summerfield & All Saints and Hammerwich & Wall means some houses in certain roads fall either side of the boundary, the most egregious being Henley Close.
 - However, the whole of the Triangle Parish Ward in Hammerwich is part of the *urban* area of Burntwood rather than the *rural* village of Hammerwich itself.

- A number of residents of Triangle ward in Hammerwich were annoyed that they had not been able to vote in the Burntwood Neighbourhood Plan Referendum because they do not live in the Burntwood Town Council area. They felt that they should have been able to “have their say”.
 - In terms of numbers of Town Councillors, there appear to be further anomalies eg Hunslet Parish ward has two members for approx 1000 electors (= 500 per member) yet Boney Hay and Central Ward has 5 members for approx. 3500 electors (ie over 700 electors per member). Summerfield & All Saints is a similar ratio.
 - Highfield ward is split into three for Parish electoral purposes, allowing individual members to focus and engage more effectively. The large District wards with multiple Parish members inhibits this. (NB each elected member is a member for the *whole* ward, not a designated part of it so it could be assumed that BH&C Parish Councillors each represent approx. 3500 electors).
7. Lichfield District Council are now launching the next stage of the consultation that will end in September with a view to considering all submissions in October and publishing the final Report and making the order in December 2022.
8. Members are asked to comment on the review.

Contact Officer

Steve Lightfoot

Town Clerk

steve.lightfoot@burntwood-tc.gov.uk

01543 677166

Community Governance Review

Report of the Cabinet Member for Regulatory, Housing and Health

Date: 20 June 2022

Agenda Item:

Contact Officer: Mark Hooper, Governance Manager/Alfie Thomas,
Governance Review Officer

Tel Number: 01543 308002

Email: Mark.hooper@lichfielddc.gov.uk,
Alfie.thomas@lichfielddc.gov.uk

Key Decision? NO

Local Ward All
Members



**Regulatory &
Licensing
Committee**

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 A community governance review (CGR) is a legal process that provides an opportunity for principal councils to review and make changes to community governance within their areas.
- 1.2 On 14 December 2021 the District Council resolved to undertake a review of the whole District. Accordingly the Terms of Reference were published on 1 February and a consultation exercise took place between 1 February - 25 April 2022.
- 1.3 A total of 98 submissions and a 67 signature petition were received. The majority of responses focused on two parishes – (i) Shenstone and (ii) Fradley and Streethay.
- 1.4 The report summarises key issues identified in the review and sets out draft recommendations.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That consideration be given to the draft recommendations set out at Appendix A and summarised in section 3.13 below.

3. Review

- 3.1 On 14 December the District Council agreed that a Community Governance Review (CGR) be conducted for the whole of the district in accordance with Part 4 Chapter 3 of the Local Government Public Involvement and Health (LGPIH) Act 2007.
- 3.2 A community governance review can consider one or more of the following:
 - Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes
 - The naming of parishes and the style of new parishes
 - The electoral arrangements for parishes (the ordinary year of election, council size and parish warding)
 - Grouping parishes under a common parish council or de-grouping parishes
 - Other types of local arrangements, including parish meetings

[ENCLOSURE NO. 4 - APPENDIX A](#)

The Consultation Process (stage 1).

- 3.3 Between 1 February and 25 April 2022 the Council invited residents and interested organisations to submit their views on existing arrangements and suggest proposals for change.
- 3.4 The CGR consultation has been undertaken in accordance with Local Government Boundary Commission for England guidance. Actions included:
- A dedicated webpage containing information about the review and an online submission form.
 - Press Releases
 - Social media messaging
 - Contacting Parish Clerks and providing them with a tool kit to publicise the review to their local community.
 - Contacting key stakeholders including other local authorities, health bodies, local businesses, local public and voluntary organisation, Schools, local MPs.

Overview of Consultation Responses

- 3.5 A total of 98 Submissions were received together with a 67 signature petition. All written submissions are available in anonymised format at **Appendix D**.
- 3.6 An initial assessment identified:
- proposals for change that indicated a degree of community consensus i.e. a critical mass
 - proposals for improving the effectiveness and efficiency of existing arrangements.
- (subject to the statutory guidance tests outlined at 3.9 and 3.10).
- 3.7 The Council is grateful to all those who contributed and took the time to express a view.

Draft Recommendations

- 3.8 The Draft Recommendations are set out at **APPENDIX A** and summarised below.
- 3.9 In arriving at recommendations a Community Governance Review is required to take into account:
- the impact of community governance arrangements on community cohesion; and
 - the size, population and boundaries of a local community or parish
- 3.10 Governance arrangements should also aim to be:
- reflective of the identities and interests of the community in that area; and
 - effective and convenient
- 3.11 Any other factors, such as council tax precept such levels, cannot be considered.
- 3.12 The draft recommendations are made with reference to
- (i) the responses received,

- (ii) the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007,
- (iii) guidance provided by the National Association of Local Councils (NALC)
- (iv) guidance provided by the Boundary Commission for England.

3.13 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. FRADLEY AND STREETHAY

(1) Fradley and Streethay Parish be split into:

- (i) Fradley Parish
- (ii) Streethay Parish

(2) That the following governance arrangements be put in place:

- A Fradley Parish Council comprising 9 councillors (321 Electors per Councillor)
- A Streethay Parish Council to comprise 5 councillors (335 electors per councillor)

2. LICHFIELD CITY

- (1)** Garrick Road Ward be incorporated into Chadsmead Ward.
Chadsmead Ward to comprise 4 Councillors (825 electors per councillor)
- (2)** Burton Old Road Ward be incorporated into Stowe Ward.
Stowe Ward to comprise 5 Councillors (985 electors per councillor)
- (3)** Pentire Road Ward be incorporated into Boley Park Ward.
Boley Park Ward to comprise 4 Councillors (849 electors per councillor)

3. LONGDON PARISH

That Longdon Parish Council be reduced from 11 councillors to 9 councillors.

Next Steps/Review Timetable

- 3.14 Draft Recommendations will be submitted to Council on 12 July 2022 for consideration. The resulting recommendations will then be published for consultation. The consultation period will run until the end of September 2022 with a view to submitting final recommendations to Council in October 2022. The final recommendations would then be formally published by December 2022.
- 3.15 The stages of the review process are outlined below: [ENCLOSURE NO. 4 - APPENDIX A](#)

Action	Timeline	Details
Publish draft recommendations	July 2022 to September 2022	Publish draft recommendations for further consultation with: • all local government electors • all town and parish councils • local groups and interested parties • publish draft recommendations on LDC website
Make final recommendations	October 2022 – Full Council meeting	Consider any further submissions/representations and prepare final recommendations for report to Full Council.
Publish final recommendations	December 2022	Publish final recommendations

Alternative Options	A community governance review is a statutory obligation of the district Council, we can delay undertaking one, however there are advantages in undertaking this review before the next District and Parish elections in 2023 or before one is invoked by request from the electorate.
Consultation	The Community Governance Review is discussed extensively with key stakeholders and residents during 2 cycles of consultation.
Financial Implications	None arising from this report. A one off reserve has been provided to support any advertising, bookings or other costs associated with the review.
Approved by Section 151 Officer	
Legal Implications	The process is detailed in Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 and advice on best practice and training has been sought from Association of Electoral Administrators to support this project.
Approved by Monitoring Officer	
Contribution to the Delivery of the Strategic Plan	This project supports the development of strong, sustainable communities with participation in decision making in respect of the governance arrangements of parish councils.

Equality, Diversity and Human Rights Implications	None identified at this stage.
Crime & Safety Issues	None identified at this stage.
Environmental Impact	None identified at this stage.
GDPR / Privacy Impact Assessment	Residents' names and addresses are redacted.

	Risk Description & Risk Owner	Original Score (RYG)	How We Manage It	Current Score (RYG)
A	Consultation is not undertaken in line with requirements of Act - HOS	LIKELIHOOD IMPACT SEVERITY	Training and advice sought from AEA	LIKELIHOOD IMPACT SEVERITY
B	There is a negative reaction to the draft recommendations in one or more parishes.	LIKELIHOOD IMPACT SEVERITY	Messaging will make it clear that the recommendations are draft proposals and no decision has been taken. The second stage consultation will consider representations for and against the draft recommendations.	LIKELIHOOD IMPACT SEVERITY
C	That review creates additional work across council services	LIKELIHOOD IMPACT SEVERITY	That a project team is established to feed in and manage the work generated by the review and any decision.	LIKELIHOOD IMPACT SEVERITY
D	Insufficient capacity to support level of consultation and considerations.	LIKELIHOOD IMPACT SEVERITY	Additional temporary resources have been put in place - risks around project team member availability due to other projects are managed	LIKELIHOOD IMPACT SEVERITY

	Background documents Any previous reports or decisions linked to this item
	Relevant web links Any links for background information which may be useful to understand the context of the report ENCLOSURE NO. 4 - APPENDIX A

1 FRADLEY AND STREETHAY

- 1.1 Fradley and Streethay Parish comprises two wards centred on the key settlements of Fradley and Streethay. There are a total of 8 Councillors (3 representing Streethay, 5 representing Fradley).

Consultation response

- 1.1 A number of submissions were received in favour splitting Fradley and Streethay Parish to create two distinct parishes one centred on Fradley, the other on Streethay. An alternative suggestion was to include Streethay as a Ward of Lichfield City Council. No submissions were received in favour of the status quo.
- 1.2 The Parish Council is supportive of creating two distinct parishes.

Overview

- 1.3 Fradley and Streethay are geographically separate settlements with their own distinct identities.
- 1.4 Both settlements have experienced significant growth to date and will continue to experience growth in the future. The population (aged 19+) is forecast to increase from 4,455 in 2022 to 6,932 in 2026.
- 1.5 The proposal to split the parish to create parishes centred on the two key settlements is consistent objective of promoting of community cohesion and would be reflective of the individual identities and interests of the two communities. Critically the proposal appears to enjoy local support.
- 1.6 Recent and continuing growth mean the population can support individual parish councils, satisfying the criteria of effective and convenient governance.
- 1.7 The Parish Council has proposed that the new Parish of Fradley comprise 10 Councillors and Streethay comprise 5. To achieve roughly similar levels of representation the recommendation proposes 9 councillors for Fradley and 5 for Streethay. Details are available at Appendix B.
- 1.8 Including Streethay as a ward of Lichfield City Council was considered as an option, however the existing Parish Council favours separate parishes for each settlement, and we are mindful that Lichfield City is already one of the biggest Parish Council's in the country (exceeding National Association of Local Council's suggested maximum of 25 Councillors).

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS:

(1) Fradley and Streethay Parish be split into:

(i) Fradley Parish

(ii) Streethay Parish

(2) That the following governance arrangements be put in place:

- A Fradley Parish Council comprising 9 Members
(321 Electors per Councillor)
- A Streethay Parish Council to comprising 5 Members
(335 electors per councillor)

2. LICHFIELD CITY

- 2.1 With a population of over 32,000 Lichfield City Council is one of the largest parish councils in England. The Council has 28 members elected to representing 9 Wards.

Consultation Response

- 2.2 Some responses express support for the status quo in Lichfield City while a number express concern about unequal councillor-to-resident ratio in some wards.

- 2.3 The City Council representation proposes that:

‘Garrick Road ward to be incorporated into Chadsmead, Burton Old Road ward into Stowe and Pentire Road ward into Boley Park, thereby creating coterminous parish and district boundaries and removing the significant confusion that exists currently.’

- 2.4 It also requests:

‘When assessing future options, LDC is asked to have regard to the current unequal allocation of councillors which results in a significant variation in the ratio of electors to councillors across Lichfield City Council wards.’

Overview

- 2.5 We consider it opportune to address two key issues raised in the consultation –

(i) The creation of coterminous parish and district boundaries satisfying the criteria of effective and convenient governance. The amalgamation of small single councillor wards into larger wards is not considered to have any detrimental impact on community identity or cohesion, indeed the larger wards would appear to represent more identifiable and coherent communities

(ii) The uneven distribution of Councillors ranging from 302 Councillors per Councillor to 1124 electors per Councillor.

- 2.6 To realise (i) above it is proposed that Garrick Road be merged with Chadsmead, Burton Old Road with Stowe and Pentire Road with Boley Park

- 2.7 To address (ii) above it is proposed the following the merger of Garrick Road with Chadsmead the representation of the new Chadsmead Ward should remain at 4 Councillors. This will mean electors per Councillor in Lichfield City will range from 782 to 1124. Details are available at Appendix C.

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

(1) Garrick Road Ward to be incorporated into Chadsmead Ward.
Chadsmead Ward to comprise 4 Councillors (825 electors per Councillor)

(2) Burton Old Road Ward be incorporated into Stowe Ward.
Stowe Ward to comprise 5 Councillors (985 electors per Councillor)

(3) Pentire Road Ward be incorporated into Boley Park Ward.
Boley Park Ward to comprise 4 Councillors (849 electors per Councillor)

ENCLOSURE NO. 4 - APPENDIX A

3. LONGDON PARISH

- 3.1 Longdon is situated midway between Lichfield and Rugeley. Key settlements include Longdon Green, Longdon (Brook End), Upper Longdon and Gentleshaw. The Council currently has 11 Members.

Consultation Response

- 3.2 The Parish Council has previously passed a resolution requesting that the District Council consider reducing the size of the Parish Council from 11 Members to 9 Members.
- 3.3 It is considered a smaller council is appropriate given the population of the parish and will (i) address difficulties experienced when filling vacancies and (ii) make it easier to achieve a quorum.

Overview

- 3.4 The Parish Council currently has 115.7 electors per councillor. The proposed reduction in Council size would result in 141 electors per councillor.

DRAFT RECOMMENDATION

That the size of Longdon Parish Council be reduced from 11 Councillors to 9 Councillors.

4. SHENSTONE PARISH

- 4.1 Shenstone is the largest parish council in Staffordshire, with 15 elected Councillors representing the 3 wards - Shenstone, Shenstone Woodend and Little Aston/Stonnall. The neighbouring villages of Little Hay and Fotherly come under Shenstone.

Consultation response

- 4.2 The majority of responses could be put into one of two groups – (i) responses in favour of the existing parish boundary and (ii) responses in favour of a new Parish of Stonnall and Lyn

- 4.3 In total, 7 written submissions were in favour of a separate parish of Stonnall and Lyn and 25 were against a split.

- 4.4 A petition for an independent Stonnall and Lyn parish council was also submitted with 67 signatories (1.1% of the existing electorate). The petition that was submitted read:

“Since its formation the area covered by Shenstone has grown massively and what were three small communities have now become far and away the largest Parish Council of the 25 in the district. Should the Lichfield District Council consultation agree to a new Stonnall and Lyn Parish Council it would probably be the 5th largest in the district. For some time, many residents have felt the time has come for Stonnall and Lynn to have its own parish council that can be more focused on the needs of our village. We are a very special community with a Church, two Village Halls, a playing field, shops, a pub, three restaurants, a school, an allotment, a website and a mass of Community groups that meet regularly including a Roads group that works to improve traffic safety, also our own Lynn and Stonnall village plan.”

- 4.5 Meanwhile the Parish Council has submitted a response in favour of the existing parish boundary. In summary it maintains that:

(i) The communities within the parish face common issues including protection of the green belt, commuter traffic, affordable homes and the devolution of services from other tiers of local government.

(ii) The three largest communities have their own Neighbourhood Plan protecting the individual priorities of each community.

(iii) The Council actively seeks to represent all three villages on the Council.

(iv) The Council has secured additional resources to benefit all residents including CIL and Rural Community Energy Fund and these are distributed to all eligible villages even if only generated by one village.

(v) The Parish Council has been managed effectively and was able to set a zero Parish Precept increase in financial years 20/21 and 21/22.

(vi) The Council has actively supported the three communities in taking over assets and functions previously provided at the County Council level at risk of potential closure.

(vii) The Parish Council has held inclusive consultation events. The scale of Parish Council resources gives it ability to effectively secure appropriate investment and service solutions.

(viii) The Parish Council Community Grant allocations total circa £25k annually achieve an overall balance between all communities over time.

(ix) The Parish Council communicates regularly with all residents using Newsletter and social media and receives formal and informal feedback on key issues from all sections of each community.

(x) The Parish Council is the largest in the District Council area. This allows service efficiencies and delivery solutions which have positively increased the reputation and satisfaction with the Parish Council.

(xi) The only village with any significant growth is in Shenstone where the Local Plan has a growth designation of c.50 new homes. No change to Shenstone Parish Council is justified by population growth.

(xii) The boundaries of the Parish Council take in the geography south of Lichfield with strong delineation provided by the A5 to the north and the Birmingham City Council boundary to the south. The current boundaries enclose communities with similar challenges, needs and ambitions.

(The full response can be viewed at Appendix D)

Overview

- 4.6 There is obviously some debate within the community regarding the possible formation of a new Parish of Stonnall and Lyn.
- 4.7 There is an argument that Stonnall and Lyn form a clearly defined community, and as such could form their own Parish. On the other hand, the Parish Council points to similarities between the communities noting that they face many of the same issues. It considers the communities benefit by facing these issues together as a slightly larger entity.
- 4.8 Both of the main settlements are likely to be able to sustain a parish council given their current population. However the Parish Council submits that its current size enables it to represent residents more effectively and efficiently.
- 4.9 There is no 'one size fits all' solution. Once the test of effective governance is satisfied (i.e. a council is not too small or too large to be effective) it is for communities to consider the optimum size.
- 4.10 As noted above the majority of written responses (25) favour the status quo. The existing arrangements are also favoured by the Parish Council. Balanced against are 7 written responses and a 67 signature petition. The relative weighting of the responses is therefore an issue to be considered.
- 4.11 To recommend a change to existing arrangements we would look for a high level of community support and consensus. Members are requested to consider the consultation responses and the draft recommendation.

DRAFT RECOMMENDATION

That Shenstone Parish remains unchanged.

ENCLOSURE NO. 4 - APPENDIX A

Appendix B – Fradley & Streethay

PRESENT

Polling Districts	Councillors	Electors - 2022	Electors per Councillor
Fradley & Streethay	8		571.13
AB		1984	
AC		909	
AD		1676	
	Total	4569	

PROPOSED

Polling Districts	Councillors	Electors	Electors per Councillor
Fradley	9		321.44
AB		1984	
AC		909	
	Total	2893	
Streethay	5		335.20
AD		1676	
	Total	1676	

APPENDIX C – Lichfield City Council

PRESENT

Ward (& polling Districts)	Councillors	Electors	Electors per Councillor
Boley Park	3		967
RA		1318	
RB		980	
RC		603	
		2901	
Burton Old Road	1		860
RD		860	
		860	
Chadsmead	4		749.5
RE		1,108	
RF		889	
RG		534	
RK		467	
		2,998	
Curborough	3		1113.67
RH		1426	
RJ		1915	
		3341	
Garrick	1		302
RG1		302	
		302	
Leamonsley	5		1124.2
RL		1203	
RM1		941	
RM2		1156	
RN1		1097	
RN2		1224	
		5621	
Pentire Road	1		497
RB1		497	
		497	
St John's	6		782.33
RP		1040	
RQ		2304	

RR		1350	
		4694	
Stowe	4		1016.75
RS		844	
RT		1156	
RU		214	
RW		414	
RX		1439	
		4067	

PROPOSED (Option 1 – Merging Wards and Retaining all Cllrs)

Ward (& polling Districts)	Councillors	Electors	Electors per Councillor
Boley Park (including Pentire Road)	4		849.50
RA		1318	
RB		980	
RC		603	
RB1		497	
		3398	
Chadsmead (including Garrick)	5		660
RE		1,108	
RF		889	
RG		534	
RK		467	
RG1		302	
		3,300	
Curborough	3		1113.67
RH		1426	
RJ		1915	
		3341	
Leamonsley	5		1124.2
RL		1203	
RM1		941	
RM2		1156	
RN1		1097	
RN2		1224	

		5621	
St John's	6		782.33
RP		1040	
RQ		2304	
RR		1350	
		4694	
Stowe (including Burton Old Road)	5		985.4
RS		844	
RT		1156	
RU		214	
RW		414	
RX		1439	
RD		860	
		4927	

PROPOSED (Option 2 – As above but Chadsmead Ward to remain at 4 Councillors following the merger with Garrick Ward)

Ward (& polling Districts)	Councillors	Electors	Electors per Councillor
Chadsmead	Chadsmead to remain at 4 rather than increasing to 5 following the addition of Garrick Ward		825 (with 5 councillors it would be 660)
RE		1,108	
RF		889	
RG		534	
RK		467	
RG1		302	
		3,300	

Appendix D

Reference	Parish	Issue	Comment	Other Issues
232194	All	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"Many areas of the country have merged and district councils, removing a layer of bureaucracy and ambiguity regarding the responsibility for local services. I suggest that Lichfield District Council adopts the role for its constituent parish councils, and the parish councils be disbanded."	N/A
245730	Alrewas - Clerk has designated authority to represent parish council	The electoral arrangements for parishes (e.g. council size and parish warding)	"Alrewas is a nuclear village and an easily identified community. It is clearly contained geographically by main roads and the River Trent. The Parish Council covers Alrewas and the adjacent hamlet of Orgreave. The Parish Council believes that NO CHANGES are needed to its organisation, its geographical remit or to the number of Cllrs. While the number of residents is growing, the number is not so great that new Cllrs are needed."	N/A
237633	Armitage and Handsacre	The electoral arrangements for parishes (e.g. council size and parish warding)	"Armitage with Handsacre Parish is large enough with distinct areas to be warded to ensure correct representation. Especially due to Hawkseyard development of 555 dwellings, larger than Kings Bromley Parish. Consideration must also be taken into the development of Rugeley Power Station with over 2500 dwellings to be built over the next 10-15 years, with approximately 1500 within Armitage with Handsacre Parish."	N/A

ENCLOSURE NO. 4 - APPENDIX A

232968	Burntwood	The electoral arrangements for parishes (e.g. council size and parish warding)	"Burntwood's population is too big for the services available. I, and many others, often have to travel for medical care or to shop for basic necessities. The area lacks curb appeal and the events are either cancelled or lack the finesse and effort that is so obvious in Lichfield and in Tamworth. It is a real shame as Burntwood has a lot to offer and deserves to be taken care of, rather than left behind, gradually becoming a suburban wasteland. Burntwood would benefit from a suitable task force and funding that gives the residents value for their tax money."	N/A
232224	Burntwood	The electoral arrangements for parishes (e.g. council size and parish warding)	"BTC not fit for purpose, delivers nothing of value, only interested in political point scoring, and should be disbanded or restructure, authority levels amended and potentially rolled into a district council."	N/A

233386	Burntwood and Hammerwich	"Burntwood, that is the area administered at the local level by Burntwood Town Council and Hammerwich Parish. Burntwood wards are an historic anomaly, having mining or, farming, or open land as their defining character. Hammerwich is an anomaly in that it was a defined agricultural parish. Since the housing developments in Chase Terrace and Chasetown in response to the slum clearance programme in Birmingham and further developments of mixed housing in both parishes housing now defines a cohesive continuous urban area, which could be viewed the new parish of, "Burntwood and Hammerwich," or even, Greater Burntwood. The generation that still regards itself as belonging to either Hammerwich, Burntwood, Chasetown, Chase Terrace and Boney Hay will no longer be with us by the time the next Review occurs. The area as a unit needs recognition of its newstatus. The respective sizes of the areas of this, "Burntwood," and Lichfield as rapidly approaching population parity. Now is the time to enable the younger generation the time necessary for it to develop its unique economic, cultural and social identity ready for the second half of the twenty first century."	N/A
--------	--------------------------	--	-----

ENCLOSURE NO. 4 - APPENDIX A

242031	Clifton Campville with Thorpe Constantine Parish Council – Clerk Response	Grouping parishes under a common parish council or de-grouping parishes	"Thank you for inviting comments from Clifton Campville with Thorpe Constantine Parish Council. The Community Governance Review was considered by the Parish Council at its Meeting on 8th March 2022, and the Council resolved to submit the following response - Having reviewed the respective documents circulated for the Community Governance Review, including the Terms of Reference, and having regard for the Guidance on Community Governance Reviews published by the Local Government Boundary Commission, the Parish Council considers that the Boundaries of the Parish of Clifton Campville and the Parish of Thorpe Constantine should remain unchanged. The Parish of Clifton Campville coincides with the Manor of Clifton Campville subsequently, the Clifton Campville and Haunton Estate, that continued as a single entity for 900 years from "Pre-Conquest" until 1905. Although there are two distinct settlements at Clifton Campville and Haunton, they jointly retain a viable community cohesiveness. The Parish of Thorpe Constantine, embracing the additional spare settlements of Stratfold and Syerscote, seems an isolated enclave beyond Clifton Campville, but it is again cohesive. Its external boundaries are effectively defined by other Districts and Counties, as are Clifton Campville's eastern and northern boundaries. The "Grouping" of the two Parishes continues to be a logical and practical arrangement. It is considered that the respective Parish Councillor representation should remain unchanged. N.B. The Parish of Thorpe Constantine appears to have been omitted from "The Parishes Included in the Review" in the Community Governance Review Documents. It does not appear as a distinct Parish, nor is it shown as if Grouped with Clifton Campville Parish"	"Boundaries of the parish of Clifton and Campville and the Parish Thorpe Constantine should remain unchanged"
253204	Colton	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"I don't see a need to alter anything"	N/

ENCLOSURE NO. 4 - APPENDIX A

247059	Curborough & Elmhurstwith Farewell & Chorley	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"There is imminent major housing development in Curborough parish and this is to be followed, according to the LDC development plan to 2040, by an even greater residential development joining Curboroughon to the now existent development at Streethay. It would seem opportune and forward-thinking, therefore, to remove Curborough from its current grouping with Elmhurst, Farewell & Chorley and either add it to the parish of Streethay,or create a self-standing parish council for the new Curborough."	N/A
257039	Drayton Bassett	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"As a Council we do not wish to undergo any changes; we are happy with the size of area, number of wards and the number of parishioners we represent. Due to our geographic location we would not wish to join with other parishes."	N/A
248695	Edingale	Other types of local arrangements, including parish meetings	"The parish council consists of people all of a very similar age and social background. It would be more truly representative of the village if the members of the council were from a broader range of backgrounds. The meetings are very predictable in their outcomes, the issues raised and discussed are quite limited in their range and I think that a more diverse group of councillors would perhaps be more interested in issues that affect the community more widely. It would be good for the village to have a parish council where some of the members could bring a wider range of experiences to the discussions and who might have a different perspective on life in the village - for example for those who need to use public transport, who perhaps live in social housing or the younger people of the community"	N/A

244093	Elford	The electoral arrangements for parishes (e.g. council size and parish warding)	"Elford Parish Council is content with the status quo and agrees to retain the current arrangements for there to be 7 Councillors and only one ward in the parish."	
Postal Submission - Received 29/04	Fazeley	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"What happens to the money the council get from our council tax. Why are you not allowed to talk in a meeting then get asked to leave when they start talking about money. Fazeley council should be Fazeley or Mile Oak people only, not someone from Tamworth Drayton or two gates. These people also have jobs on other councils."	"I think fazeley council should be abolished - no one tells you about the meetings so why should there be a council"
Postal Submission - Received 29/04	Fazeley	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes, The electoral arrangements for parishes (e.g. council size and parish warding), other types of local arrangements,	"More response from council on community issues"	"Acting on problems of pollution in Parish"
255264	Fazeley	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"I believe Fazeley TC should be abolished as an entity and merged with Tamworth, as an example. This council has been totally ineffective for many years - illustrated by the local Residents' Association's D.I.Y. job on improving traffic problems in Victoria Drive, Albert Road and Mill Lane, Fazeley. I believe Fazeley TC has had no effect whatsoever on community cohesion."	N/A

ENCLOSURE NO. 4 - APPENDIX A

259706	Fazeley	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"Little sign of usefulness of Fazeley Town Council to residents apart from the improvements to the actual town hall and its immediate surroundings. Further improvements are due with a new floor for the town hall. What else is scheduled for the benefit of actual residents rather than the councillors? A regular update to the council's website would be useful and welcome and wouldn't cost £6000. The salaries and expenses of the council are a major part of its income. If the council were abolished and Lichfield took over, I would imagine the majority of work done could be adsorbed by Lichfield with a considerable saving of costs. If abolishing is not attainable, I would suggest reducing number of councillors. I would suggest reducing the number of members of the council without impacting on the work it does and could save some additional expenses on the parish. We have 11 councillors (only five of whom live in the parish and would have first hand knowledge of local requirements) Of these 11, one could only manage to attend two meetings out of the websites published minutes between Jan 2020 and March 2021. Latest published on website. Two councillors managed three meetings and one managed four. The work was undertaken by a core of seven councillors which seems adequate for this parish. All info is from old website which urgently needs updating."	"Council Size"
Postal	Fazeley	None ticked	"Pollution - yellow dust over car and windowsills"	N/A

ENCLOSURE NO. 4 - APPENDIX A

Postal Submissi on - Received 29/04	Fazeley - Fazeley Residents Association	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"There is General dissatisfaction in community for the working of Fazeley Town Council and its efficiency and effectiveness. Minutes of their meeting were not current before Covid often long gaps before being on their website. A long-standing issue. Viewed as a local/secret self-focused club for members who have little interest in the community locally. 'What do they do is often a comment' FTC gained approval in 2018 to develop a neighbourhood plan and 4 years later still waiting. Local respected businesses people and retired Local Government Manager were approached by the Clerk to participate and then nothing happened, and they heard nothing. Such disregard for community members. Not in keeping with current thinking on community involvement. Mill Lane Link, a community resource was closed without community consultation in 2018 a loss to the community. A District Councillor said that the Community Manager at LDC was a "bully" and tried to mislead the Resident Association members who had asked for an explanation by saying that the working papers were subject to confidentiality. It was investigated and found that this was not so and the FTC had not responded to LDC and would benefit from transferring the polling station funding for the Town Hall. It was closed for £1000 a year. A Resident's Association worker was then also labelled as a bully in raising this matter. The legal officer at Lichfield was surprised that a District Councillor should that the details of that matter were not in the public domain. It was too late to change the decision and remains an issue for long term residents of the community who valued the resource and regretted its loss. Our community was an unsafe car parking location for all sorts of vehicles some left for days, blocking drives parking on pavements. A local councillor indicated that they had been trying to get something done for 18 years and could not get anything done. The Resident's Association decided to take action themselves and secured grants and the support of our County Councillor and effective working with County officers and that work from start to finish in 16 months. We are aware that this did not go down well with FTC. Similarly, when the Town council was approached to meet the Defra investigating officer from London and several businesses locally relating to the consequences of developments at Drayton Manor Business Park at the Marina no one came or gave apologies. Although the Clerk had warned that the particular councillor did not always keep in touch. A request for a meet up relating to pollution was similarly disregarded viewed on Utube most arrogantly. The Resident's Association now simply gets on with the matters that need to be addressed in our community. There are concerns about financial management that appear not to be transparent and the use of the precept. It would seem that a lot of money is spent on the building and concerns that the car park is reserved only for use by users of the hall when it could ease parking in the village itself and perhaps gain some income. As we operate a Wellbeing Project locally, we do understand that payments for School Crossing have been late and seems to have stopped. No promotion of pride in the locality presentation or the addressing of bus transport and costs to Lichfield and Tamworth before lockdown. The distance from Lichfield which the community considers is neglected by Lichfield District Council and considered that the Town Council should be abolished and incorporated into Tamworth."	"a merger with Tamorth and on the abolishing of this town council"
---	---	---	--	---

ENCLOSURE NO. 4 - APPENDIX A

233407	Fradley and Streethay	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"Fradley was once a small village. It is now one of four strategic housing development zones in the District and as such has lost its identity as a village. I am concerned that the village boundary will be changed to allow for more housing, particularly on land known as The Sale, which lies between the old village and Ogreave. There is no need to build more houses in Fradley. LDC's housing numbers are adequate for their housing needs and there is no need to extend the parish boundary across open farmland simply to build more houses."	N/A
231943	Fradley and Streethay	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"I think with the size (recent Roman Heights housing development) of Streethay we need our own Parish Council, to include our own budget and decision making, it's own Chair and Councillors. The current shared ownership does not favour Streethay, indeed I feel we get less benefits than our neighbour, Fradley. A dedicated team to pursue what is best for our residents is paramount. The meetings can be held in Streethay giving the opportunity for locals to attend, as opposed to Fradley, currently. We also need to serve the local Streethay residents better in the way we make informed decisions, how we involve them and making them aware of the current/future agenda(s)."	N/A

ENCLOSURE NO. 4 - APPENDIX A

231983	Fradley and Streethay	Grouping parishes under a common parish council or de-grouping parishes	"Fradley should be it's own independent parish, separate to Streethay. It has grown, and continues to grow rapidly, and with its population size (which now exceeds Alrewas, which has its own parish) justifying it being de-grouped from Streethay. This would allow a focus on Fradley's unique issues and opportunities, which in many cases are distinct to Streethay. It would also allow for better local governance and accountability. Fradley is becoming a very large village/small town and should be targeted for additional infrastructure and funding where necessary. Fradley would be better represented if it had its own parish council concentrating on maximising the opportunity from its exponential growth. Streethay could be added to Lichfield City, as it contiguous with Lichfield and not Fradley."	N/A
233283	Fradley and Streethay	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"Streethay and Fradley are geographically separate and it makes no sense to have them as a joined parish council. Vast house building in these areas make the need for a joint parish council redundant. It would be better to scrap parish councils to provide better value for money to taxpayers and introduce an Area Committee/Area Manager system as per Walsall Council. It would be even better if Lichfield were to become a unitary council, perhaps by merging with Tamworth and or Cannock and abolishing Staffordshire County Council. This has happened in Northamptonshire. At the moment we have lots of councillors, lots of potholes and lots of people blaming everyone else. The three tier system is poor value for money and has poor outcomes for residents."	"Lichfield should move to become a unitary council and end the threetier system in Staffordshire."

247037	Fradley and Streethay	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"Parish Councils are too small to effectively operate but Lichfield District appears too remote. I do not know who my local councillor is without looking on the LDC website. LDC councillors only appear to be more prominent around election time so if the Parish Council was to be abolished, the representative councillor would have to be more prominent within the area"	N/A
247115	Fradley and Streethay	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"I understand that Fradley is one of four development zones and that house building continues at a pace in the village. A recent very reasonable request to build a house was refused because the location, Cow Hill Lane, was outside the village boundary. I and my neighbours are concerned that the village boundary will be extended simply to accommodate the needs of developers, who want to build yet more homes in our village. This must not be allowed. Please ensure that Fradley keeps its village identity and does not turn into a massive housing estate that is starved of the facilities it needs to be sustainable in planning terms."	N/A

ENCLOSURE NO. 4 - APPENDIX A

254608	Fradley and Streethay	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"Fradley has many issues that need to be addressed in the parish council meetings (I am currently a parish councillor representing Streethay on the Fradley and Streethay parish council) so Fradley really needs to be a parish on its own. It is certainly big enough. Streethay is geographically quite separate from Fradley. There are some geographical barriers between Fradley and Streethay: the A38 which is horrendously busy and the HS2 will add to the sense of separation between the two. The periodic closures of the A38 and slip roads add to the sense of separation. Streethay residents tend to look to Lichfield for many goods and services: shopping, doctors, recycling etc etc so it is much more natural for Streethay to be separated from Fradley and for it to become part of the Lichfield DC"	N/A
255160	Fradley and Streethay	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"My proposal would be that Streethay becomes its own parish. Streethay is a growing area that needs its own voice to deal with the amount of development that has happened in the area and then to ensure that its natural development is relevant to Streethay rather than being part of Fradley or Lichfield"	N/A
255162	Fradley and Streethay	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"Streethay and Fradley Parish council is an outdated model. Fradley is becoming a large settlement and needs a parish council of its own taking this into consideration. Streethay should have a seat on Lichfield City Council with the City Council boundaries being extended to encompass Streethay."	N/A
255297	Fradley and Streethay	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"I think Streethay should merge with Lichfield as this makes the most logistical sense"	N/A

255346	Fradley and Streethay	Grouping parishes under a common parish council or de-grouping parishes	"Streethay should be a separate parish or part of Lichfield. Currently Fradley is the main focus of the existing parish and Fradley is big enough to be a separate parish"	N/A
255503	Fradley and Streethay	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"Given that Fradley is so big it really needs its own parish but I don't agree streethay should be listed under LDC as it's its own community and needs a town parish council"	N/A
256925	Fradley and Streethay	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"Streethay has grown and continues to grow and should be a parish in its own right"	N/A
259755	Fradley and Streethay	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"Fradley to become its own parish without Streethay"	N/A
260408	Fradley and Streethay	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"Fradley is now large enough to be its own Parish, similar to Alrewas. Streethay could be an independent Parish with a small precept or be part of Lichfield City Council with a larger precept"	N/A
260807	Fradley and Streethay	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"I feel that Streethay should form its own parish council, based on the fact that its population has expanded massively with the new housing, plus is set to expand further with more housing allocations. Its needs are also distinct from those of Fradley, which again should be its own parish for the same reasons as Streethay."	N/A

258865	Fradley and Streethay - Parish Clerk	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"Dear Sir/Madam, Fradley and Streethay Parish Council would like to comment on theCommunity Governance Review as follows: creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes. Fradley and Streethay Parish Council feels that Fradley and Streethay should be split into two separate parishes with their own Parish Councils. This is supported by the fact that there is a natural split between the two parishes with the A38 and the construction of HS2. Both parishes are also developing quite rapidly. Naming of parishes and determining the style of new parishes The separate Parish Councils we think should be named as follows: - Fradley Parish Council - Streethay Parish Council electoral arrangements for parishes e.g. the year of election, council size (the number of councillors) and parish warding. If the split is considered, Fradley Parish Council would like to increase their Councillors to 10 Councillors from the current 8 Councillors, andwe think that a new Streethay Parish Council should have 5 Parish Councillors. Yours sincerely CM Orme Mrs Clare Orme – Clerk/RFO to Fradley and Streethay Parish Council"	"The naming of parishes, the electoral arrangements, the council size."
235737	Hammerwich	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"I cannot see any reason for merging Hammerwich Parish with any other parishes."	N/A

ENCLOSURE NO. 4 - APPENDIX A

236309	Hammerwich	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"the parish of Hammerwich (which borders Burntwood) is semi rural and belongs to Staffordshire. I would not wish this to become part of, for example, Brownhills, which would then bring us into the West Midlands conurbation. I do not wish to lose our green spaces, such as the Triangle field in which i and many others enjoy walking our dogs. Recreation is very important to us and to be swallowed up by other larger parishes would be detrimental to our way of life I think. I am very happy with the way that Burntwood council, and Hammerwich council, are aware of the issues that we raise, especially the keeping of our green belt"	N/A
257942	Hammerwich	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"Hammerwich is a great place to live. It is safe, clean and has a good sense of community. If we are merged into a larger Parish or District, I feel we have everything to lose, and nothing to gain, except an increase in our council tax."	N/A
257968	Hammerwich	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"Please leave Hammerwich as a separate parish with its own council. The interests of Hammerwich and its residents will be best served in this way as Hammerwich councillors know their parish"	N/A
258219	Hammerwich	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"Overall Hammerwich is a nice place to live. Generally, it is safe, clean and there is a good sense of community. If we are merged into a larger Parish or District, then I feel we can only lose out and will have nothing explicit nothing to gain. Clearly we would lose out and have to pay more in our council tax."	N/A

ENCLOSURE NO. 4 - APPENDIX A

260275	Hammerwich	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"Why change something that is very good into an extra-large community"	"I moved to hammerwich in 2018 because it is a very good village. by changing boundaries etc will change what the village is about, whychange something thatis very good"
--------	------------	--	--	---

257980	Hammerwich - Parish Clerk	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"Boundary review 2022 Hammerwich Parish do not request any boundary changes under this review. Hammerwich Local Plan After a great deal of research, and consultation with parishioners and relevant departments at Lichfield District Council, our Local Plan went to a referendum in December 2021. Plan was made available to all our 3,412 residents, (from 1406 households). No responses were made asking changes to our boundaries to be considered. In a referendum more than eighty percent of voters supported the plan. Green Spaces in Hammerwich We provide and manage green spaces in Oakwood Park, The Triangle and Jubilee Park on Hospital Road. All three are in or adjoining the Triangle Ward, but serve the whole parish Hammerwich and Burntwood all residents who wish to make use of the facilities. Jubilee Park is the home of Burntwood Dragons, and there is also a popular play area provided in the park. Open Countryside Our network of footpaths is a gateway for Burntwood residents to enjoy our protected countryside. The network is very popular with ramblers and dog walkers from Hammerwich and Burntwood and other neighbouring parishes. Greenbelt Our parish is virtually surrounded by Greenbelt. In the past, developers have made strong representations to build on Greenbelt land, mostly bordering the Triangle ward. With the full support of the council, a 'Save our Greenbelt' action group was set up, which fought hard to protect all our Greenbelt. It played a large part in successfully safeguarding the Greenbelt until 2040, as published in our Local Plan. Parsh Council Management. We consider our council operates very efficiently. We hold meetings every month which are well attended, and chaired by thevery experienced Vance Wasdell. We work very closely with Lichfield District Council and Staffordshire County Council representing all our parishioners and groups. We have an excellent Parish Clerk, Ellen Bird, who works for us on a part time basis. She is very well versed in local government procedures and the protocols involved. She produces all our meeting agendas and minutes, which she publishes on our website, along with pertinent news and announcements. She also takes responsibility for our fiscal disciplines, and compiles our audited accounts on time, every time. Zoom meetings during Covid lockdown ensured our meetings continued throughout the pandemic. Community support We support many community groups, (with guidance and grants), which serve both Hammerwich and Burntwood residents. These include Hammerwich Cricket Club, Burntwood Dragons (on our Jubilee Park sports ground), with the Triangle being very popular, particularly with local dog owners. Other local groups including. Hammerwich Garden Guild, Women's Institute, War Games Group, Cricket Club, Burntwood Dragons etc. are actively encouraged and supported. We work very closely with Staffordshire County Council in maintaining our lanes drains and hedgerows etc. We look forward to the Platinum Jubilee and have a steering group co-ordinating groups in the parish, and with Burntwood Town Council sharing facilities and timing of events. We have made provision in our budgets to support events. Population and Parish Income. Our population is approximately 3,412 residents, from 1406 households, the largest ward being the Triangle ward, which accounts for well over half of households. Our income comes directly from our	N/A
--------	---------------------------	--	--	-----

			precept. Any change to our boundary could be catastrophic for us. Our precept is the lowest in the area. Conclusion We are a very well-run parish which is appreciated by parishioners. We have no intentions to expand or merge our boundaries, or surrender wards to neighbouring parishes or councils. We are also happy with the name Hammerwich Parish Council."	
259889	Hammerwich with Wall	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"As a District Cllr for Hammerwich with Wall I fully support Hammerwich Parish Council in their response to the CGR."	N/A

Email Response	Hammerwich, Hints and Canwell, Shenstone, Wall, Weeford - County Councillor Lichfield - Lichfield Rural South	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"As a consultee on the governance review, I have discussed any possible change on each of the five Parish Councils in my division and offer them to Lichfield District Council for consideration. 1) Hammerwich This is a Parish of two halves consisting of Hammerwich Village and Triangle Ward there is an argument that the latter is as much part of Burntwood as Hammerwich but the traditional links pull very strongly against this sadly neither area is well blessed with facilities although there is a village hall, a WI hall, a church and a licensed club. Also, Oakwood Park with recreation facilities and a football pitch the village is also home to the popular Hammerwich Cricket Club, also it has a large primary school that also serves Burntwood. There is a strong community spirit with a number of organisations that regularly meet and the Parish Council has a close affinity to the residents. The Parish Council have just completed a village plan which received considerable support from both the village and triangle ward and this has the effect of binding the community together. On the basis of my experience, I would not recommend any change. And I fully support the Hammerwich Parish submission to Lichfield District Council 2) Hints with Canwell It's always difficult with small communities like Hints and Canwell to bring them together to be of a viable size and there are inevitably strains but on balance the Parish Council works well. Hints has many active organisations and despite the village's limited facilities works well. It has a Church and an active Village Hall but has suffered badly from the development of HS2 which rips through the heart of the community. It has also suffered from many properties being purchased by HS2 some of which have either been left empty or let on short leases which does not help community spirit but sadly it lacks any facilities. Canwell is somewhat different with no natural centre, it has the Quinney Hall that provides some focus and a degree of affinity with the Canwell Estate Company and apart from the problems with Covid stages a superb agricultural show. It also has a Church. On balance I can't see any alterations that would benefit this community. 3) Shenstone This presents the greatest difficulty Shenstone Parish Council has grown to become by far the largest in the district encompassing three large communities each of which could support its own Parish Council and have little in common. Sadly it has grown to a point that it is neither a Parish Council or a larger Council and tries to play above its weight to the expense of the individual villages. For as long as I have been a resident in the Parish area (50 years) there has been a feeling that particularly Stonnall would be better served with its own Parish Council. Stonnall and Lynn have two Community Halls, a larger one that houses major events and the Community Centre that caters for most of the village organisations, both are well attended and the latter has just completed its transfer to a new Community Charity. It is proposed to replace this building with a new Community Centre over the next five years. There is also a well-used Playing field with a football pitch, children's play area and an enclosed skateboard area, it also has a well-supported primary school. I have consulted with representatives of most of the many organisations that meet in the village and the unanimous view supports this. Representatives of most of the Village	N/A
-------------------	--	--	---	-----

activities have signed a petition to this effect, this has not been done on a door-to-door basis but gives a clear view of the village feeling. I assume that LDC as part of the second stage consultation will undertake this. The Village supports a small range of shops including two ladies' hairdressing salons, two general stores a tattoo parlour, a kitchen shop, three Indian restaurants two pubs and a petrol station. So as a community it is very well self-contained. The village also produced its own local plan The population is approximately 1,546 so can adequately support its own Parish Council.

Little Aston is a different conundrum with an estimated population of 2,920 consisting of a very large private estate of gated properties as are many of the other homes across the area. It has two shopping centres one at Streetly Village and one at Blake Street junction. Little Aston suffers from a long border with Birmingham. There is a Village Hall that is well used a Primary school, a private hospital, a Church within the private estate and a station but it lacks a natural centre. There is a park with a children's playground and this is run by a community group and holds a major summer event. Little Aston suffers from a major flow of traffic travelling from Birmingham to Walsall and beyond. Because of its nature Little Aston does not benefit greatly from the Parish Council and largely subsidises Shenstone. My feeling is that this needs to be addressed in the review.

Shenstone The village is well provided with shops pubs and community facilities together with a business park and a large garden centre, Like the rest of the council area it suffers from major rat running and also heavy vehicles travelling to the business park that unfortunately includes a transport hub. It has a large well used village hall plus a small brick-built hall that is in need of major repairs, it also has a Church Hall a Methodist Hall and a licensed Club. It also benefits from a well-used community library that also has a small tea room. In addition to the Church there is a historic tower that is in the process of restoration. My understanding looking at the level of grant payments made Shenstone benefits considerably from the precept paid by Little Aston which is the largest contributor but over the last three years has only benefitted by 16%.

Consultation I have not been consulted by Shenstone Parish Council on the LDC review and I do not believe they have carried out a community consultation so the views I have expressed are from community discussions I have had with key representatives and are not a comprehensive Council wide study, I believe that they are representative of concerns and have resulted in a community led petition, should LDC decide that there is not a case for new Parishes there is an argument for a review of the way the Parish works.

4) Wall

The village is very small and provides a centre for a group of hamlets that bring it to a reasonable size it has a village hall that is home to a number of activities together with a Church, popular/pub restaurant and a well-attended Roman site, it could be argued that it could be merged with an adjoining parish but by its nature I don't think this would provide a benefit to the diverse community. The Parish Council works well and I support their wish to remain unchanged.

5) Weeford This is a problem as it is so small with just over 150 residents that on several fronts it is barely viable. The Clerk tells me that the village hall is let long term for a rental equivalent to his salary so there is little left from the

precept that benefits the community. It also has a Church that is struggling to survive but it does have a thriving restaurant. The only change I would suggest could be considered is looking at Little Hay, for some reason the last district boundary review moved Shenstone Wood End into Bourne Vale Ward which looks odd with half of Little Hay sitting in Weeford and the other half in Shenstone. I would not suggest that Shenstone Wood End moved but clearly Little Hay is in the wrong place and a re-adjustment would ease the Weeford problem "

ENCLOSURE NO. 4 - APPENDIX A

260255	Harlaston - Parish Clerk	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"Harlaston Parish Council feels that the existing arrangements in terms of the number, size and organisation of parish councils works well. Harlaston Parish Council represents a small, but distinctive community within the district. Merging Harlaston with other neighbouring parish councils would serve to undermine the unique voice that it is currently able to have in representing local people."	N/A
249751	Hints and Canwell	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"Local Parish Councils are essential for local freedom and pride in the area, cleanliness, etc.. Once a Local Parish is merged (and, therefore LOST) within a larger council the local pride is diminished in the smaller area. there are less community people giving up their free time, supporting their community."	N/A

ENCLOSURE NO. 4 - APPENDIX A

255758	Hints and Canwell (Organisation: Smith Brothers Farm)	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"Split Hints from Canwell and have 2 separate Parish Councils"	"Rather than amalgamating Parishes Hints should be split from Canwell. The needs and care of the community would be better served by 2 Parish Councils . The construction of the HS2 will make it more difficult for the Community interests to be considered by 1 forum"
233451	Kings Bromley	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"Individual parish councils have few effective powers relating to traffic, policing and social behaviour. Some matter can and should be managed by a specific parish council but when the same issue affects adjoining parishes, the response should be combined. This will allow "a bigger voice" to be raised at County level."	N/A

242080	Kings Bromley	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW Key Points - 'If it ain't broke, why fix it? The present Parish Council that serves the KB community believes that it is both efficient and effective in what it does. This does not mean that there is no need or room for improvement but it does mean that to be the successful mechanism for local influence that it represents by providing the parish with a voice in the face of significant challenges its area of responsibility should remain singularly local as defined by current boundaries and not shared with other parishes who may have differing agenda. We can, and do, work with others when mutually beneficial but sharing territorial definition does not necessarily create or define common purpose. 'Local' should mean 'local'. - Kings Bromley is a well-defined village with clear, established boundaries. It is not closely aligned with neighbouring towns or villages. It would be an artificial and unnecessary action to join us with any other parishes. On Lichfield District Council, we are in the same Ward as Armitage/Handsacre and the Ridwares. villages with which we have little to connect with but understand the requirement of LDC to have wards of about the same size. This need is not sufficient for damaging the uniqueness of vision of purpose possessed by each community. As a parish council, and through our local neighbourhood plan, we are determined to create an even stronger sense of community as we demonstrated during the Covid crisis. - We have a number of issues that are specific to Kings Bromley, especially HS2, which sees us as a parish coping with the arrival of two waves of construction that will last throughout the next decade. We believe we are almost unique in having to deal with this and consequently it would seem inappropriate to imagine that we might be supported by working in partnership with parishes that do not face the extent of issues we do. Similarly traffic usage in the village at particular times (such as when diversions operate,) make our needs and resolutions unique to us. - The Lichfield District Plan to 2040 does not propose any significant housing development in the village, resulting in the village remaining at round about its existing size and within its present boundaries. - Kings Bromley has a very active Parish Council. It encourages and supports many active clubs and organisations centred on the Village Hall and Cricket Club. It has an Annual Show attended by people from all over the District, annual Open Gardens week-end and has won the 'Best Kept Village' competition for 6 of the last 7 years. Over the past few years, it has re-furbished the Village Hall, fought hard and achieved restrictions on HGV's coming through the Village, has regular litter picks and is establishing wild-flower gardens and community orchards and open spaces in the Village. Like most effective villages, it has an active Village Hall, locally owned pub, Church and Co-op store. Having its own Parish Council is essential to maintain its community identity - We are not clear as to what advantages any review and changes might bring. When propositions are brought forward then we will comment again and, if necessary vigorously oppose ideas that might damage our work as well as welcome ideas that supports the effective work of successful council's like our own. Recommendations Kings Bromley should retain its own Parish Council with 7 members and elections every 4 years. Local democracy is not just about talking but is tested by actions and outcomes. Kings Bromley PC members, supported by its Clerk and local handyman, voluntarily do things for the community by leading from the front in a hands-on way and encouraging and supporting other village organisations. Further improvement might result	N/A
--------	---------------	--	---	-----

		by increasing powers or funding of parish councils especially if this means taking on some of the roles performed by the District and County Council. Overall, you do not encourage public engagement by removing opportunities to participate – you engage them if they think they can be encouraged to make their communities better."
232402	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"Please leave the boundary of Lichfield City unchanged"
	Lichfield City	N/A

232534	Lichfield City	The electoral arrangements for parishes (e.g. council size and parish warding)	"At present, there are 3 very small wards which could be amalgamated to correspond with the District Wards, They are; Pentite Road which could be amalgamated into Boley Park Ward. Garrick Ward which has a very small electorate and could be amalgamated into Chadsmeade Ward and Trent Valley Ward which could be amalgamated into Stowe Ward. All three wards are very small and could easily be accommodated into the existing District Wards without detriment to the Parish Authority."	N/A
233379	Lichfield City	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"Since coming to live in Lichfield over 10 years ago, I have never encountered a convincing reason why we have a Parish Council in addition to a District and a County Council. The existence here of a Parish Council is not justified. It makes for increased costs - an additional precept - and a confusion overpowers and responsibilities. I appreciate that Lichfield is an ancient City with a heritage of Civic government but in the twenty-first century this can be safely entrusted to The District that carries the name. I do not think it justifiable to ask me and my fellow citizens to finance a superfluous level of local government, with its meetings and bureaucracy."	N/A
233335	Lichfield City	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"I feel that Lichfield City Council should be merged with Lichfield District Council. This would save duplication; confusion of which council is responsible for which service + costs. Can we justify or afford 3 layers of Local Government with in Staffordshire? I also feel the Parish Councils should also be looked at."	N/A

248836	Lichfield City	The electoral arrangements for parishes (e.g. council size and parish warding)	"I am concerned about the unequal numbers of residents in parish Wards represented by Councillors. For example, over 1,000 residents per Councillor in Leomandsley and Curborough and around 750 residents per Councillor in Chadsmead. I would suggest ending the single Councillor Wards and adding a Councillor to Curborough or Leomandsley, although I also have concerns about the large number of Councillors in Leomandsley and St. John's Wards."	N/A
257454	Lichfield City	The electoral arrangements for parishes (e.g. council size and parish warding)	"I note that currently ward size and numbers of Councillors vary a great deal with some single Councillor wards and others like Leomansley with multiple Councillors. I would support the absorption of the three one seat wards into the appropriate larger wards. It would also be fairer to have more equal ratios of voters to Councillors across the parish. This could be done by redistribution of Councillors between wards. Ideally, however I would support dividing large wardslike Leomansley into two - perhaps by separating Darwin park and the areas around Beacon Street. I believe this would lead to closer interaction between voters and their representatives and acknowledge the distinctive character of new developments. There are similar issues in St John's."	N/A

ENCLOSURE NO. 4 - APPENDIX A

242984	Lichfield City - Delegated authority has been given to him by LCC to respond in the name of the city council to the consultation	The electoral arrangements for parishes (e.g. council size and parish warding)	"In regard to its own parish arrangements, the City Council wishes to confirm the view it has expressed over the past several years. The Council wishes Garrick Road ward to be incorporated into Chadsmead, Burton Old Road ward into Stowe and Pentire Road ward into Boley Park, thereby creating coterminous parish and district boundaries and removing the significant confusion that exists currently. In regard to areas not currently within the City Council's purview, and mindful of the ongoing Boundary Review being undertaken by Boundary Commission England, the City Council wishes to once again formalise its support for Streethay Ward becoming part of the Lichfield City Parish, but any decision to drive this proposal should be initially subject to the view of Streethay residents. When assessing future options, LDC is asked to have regard to the current unequal allocation of councillors which results in a significant variation in the ratio of electors to councillors across LCC wards. Finally, the City Council wishes me to confirm the Council's desire for the recommendations of the review to be implemented in time for the 2023 local elections."	"Unequal allocation of councillors Timescale for implementation"
254841	Lichfield City - St Johns and others	The electoral arrangements for parishes (e.g. council size and parish warding)	"I feel the council should look more closely at making the parish allocation more even so that the No of voters in each Parish is more evenly divided. This could be done better by combining the one- member wards and adjusting the No of councillor's in each ward to ensure a more even and fairer distribution."	N/A

ENCLOSURE NO. 4 - APPENDIX A

248044	Lichfield City (on behalf of Lichfield Branch Labour Party)	The electoral arrangements for parishes (e.g. council size and parish warding)	"The existence in the same circumscription of both 1-person-1 vote and 1-person-6 votes is evidently unacceptable, especially as the electoral system encourages block voting by party label. 2) The rapid development of new housing estates will inevitably necessitate new ward boundaries and any planned changes should reflect the future structure of the City"	"Democratic balance"
256752	Shenstone	Grouping parishes under a common parish council or de-grouping parishes	"I do not wish for Stonnall to become an independent parish from Shenstone parish. I cannot see any benefit in this arrangement therefore would prefer Stonnall to remain part of Shenstone parish"	N/A
Email 20/04	Shenstone	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"I am writing as a resident of Stonnall, regarding the community Governance Review. I live at 25 Garnet Close, and have lived in the village for 24 years. I am utterly opposed to independence for Stonnall and Lynn and wish to remain a joint ward of Shenstone Parish Council. The current governance has worked perfectly well for decades, and I see absolutely no benefit whatsoever to Stonnall or Lynn from any separation from Shenstone, only negatives. Any change from the current governance has the potential to ; Limit the access of Stonnall and Lynn to future funding, Increase Council Tax in Stonnall and Lynn, Remove Stonnall and Lynn from the benefits of the Lengthsman Scheme, Reduce property prices in Stonnall and Lynn. Thank you for taking my view into account."	N/A
257576	Shenstone	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"Independence for Stonnall What a ridiculous idea, Stonnall is not large enough to go independent. There is nothing wrong with Shenstone council they do a good job."	N/A

ENCLOSURE NO. 4 - APPENDIX A

257977	Shenstone	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"I am concerned having spoken to various people in the village it seems that there may have been some coercion used regarding the signing of the petition. Also, the petition, which I was asked to sign in the Stonnall newsagent was headed Shenstone Parish Council, inferring it had been organised by the Parish Council, and I know this is not the case. I refused to sign the petition and I am against the split of Stonnall from Shenstone ParishCouncil."	N/A
--------	-----------	--	--	-----

259378	Shenstone	Grouping parishes under a common parish council or de-grouping parishes	"I am a Stonnall resident. The question posed for Stonnall is would it benefit from de grouping away from Shenstone and Little Aston. The District Council should now leaflet drop every Stonnall residence advising of the community governance review, give the community 6 weeks for all parties to give their views and then hold a secret ballot."	"Stonnall residents have been canvassed by an unnamed person to become an independent parish council. This petition incorrectly gives the impression as coming from Shenstone Parish Council and has been distributed at many community events. Furthermore on two community Facebook pages residents were further urged to sign the paper copy, again posted by an unnamed contributor. If this person declares Stonnall supports separating from Shenstone on the basis of this petition,
--------	-----------	---	---	---

259409	Shenstone	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"As residents of Stonnall for more than 50 years we have been and still are very satisfied with the way Shenstone Parish Council is run. Discovering that a petition (by an unnamed writer), and online Social Media campaign had been circulating regarding the Community Governance Review, we were glad to obtain information from Shenstone Parish Council making everyone aware of all the facts before making any personal decisions. The following came to light: Over the last five years SPC has spent an average of £25,759 per year in Stonnall. This amount covers LDC ground maintenance and cleaning contracts, Community Grants, refuse collection, insurance and rates for the two Community buildings. These costs did not include the shared services of the Clerk and Lengthsman PL insurance. Therefore, an Independent Stonnall would require to pay for the above plus the cost of its own Parish Clerk (£12,500-£14,00pa, in accordance with local authority pay-scales) Without the availability of the Lengthsman, Stonnall would need to buy in ad-hoc contractors to cover this work with a possible cost of £4,000p.a. An estimated cost of £5,000 would be required to cover other costs such as IT/Website, Internal and External Auditors etc. "Based on historical demands, Stonnall would need a minimum of £55,000 and the parish portion of the Council Tax would need to rise substantially to cover the costs" Considering all the above, it would seem to us to be highly impossible for an independent Stonnall to maintain the maintenance of the community buildings and also give support, via grant funding to various community groups, as SPC have for many years. We can be proud of Stonnall and therefore wish to remain a ward of Shenstone Parish Council. Yours sincerely Dorothy and Tony Horton All figures can be verified in SPC's audited accounts"	N/A
--------	-----------	--	--	-----

ENCLOSURE NO. 4 - APPENDIX A

259804	Shenstone	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"I understand there is a petition circulating in Stonnall with regard to separating from Shenstone Parish Council to go alone. I have done my own research into the pros and cons of this and I do not want to separate from Shenstone. I believe there is a certain County Councillor who lives in Stonnall who has initiated this petition for his own agenda and is misleading residents which I believe is an abuse of his current position. I feel that Stonnall would have a lot to lose if we were to go alone and we are definitely stronger together with Shenstone and Little Aston. Shenstone Parish Council has done a lot for Stonnall over the years and we would not be able to achieve the same things if we were on our own."	N/A
259853	Shenstone	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"There has been some suggestions and petitions going around Stonnall regarding it creating its own parish council away from Shenstone. The feedback that I have been getting is that majority do not want this and wish to remain as part of Shenstone Parish council."	N/A

ENCLOSURE NO. 4 - APPENDIX A

234118	Shenstone	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"I believe the time for Parish Councils have passed and they should be abolished in their entirety. The qualification for being a councillor is "having time to attend meetings"/resident but no skills or experience so the quality of councillors are poor. Councillors serve their own interests and funding etc finds its way into the same organisations every year. So many things that really concern residents, such as parking badly, speeding, shops, anti social behaviour, crime, planning aren't in the councils remit. At most parish councils can only advise. Their "duties" such as allocating contracts could all be done by LDC. Time for them to go. Shenstone would be a nicer more inclusive place without the parishcouncil"	N/A
237618	Shenstone	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"I feel that Stonnall is a large enough village to be served by its own individualparish council, whilst it is grouped under Shenstone I feel sometimes we are overlooked as the parish office is in Shenstone. The parish clerk is fabulous!"	N/A
237631	Shenstone	Grouping parishes under a common parish council or de-grouping parishes	"Shenstone should be its own and not have Stonnall and Little Aston as a joint one. As a Stonnall resident, I feel the current set up is weighed too heavily in favour of Shenstone and it's residents"	N/A

237635	Shenstone	Grouping parishes under a common parish council or de-grouping parishes	"It would be better if Stonnall was a separate parish council. When any issues arise in the village, we never seem to get them resolved and meetings which are promised to deal with them never materialise."	"I would like Stonnall to have its own separate parish council. This would still be the 5th largest parish council in Staffordshire. We feel that Stonnall is overshadowed by Shenstone and Little Aston when decisions are made."
237636	Shenstone	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"It would be better if Stonnall was a Parish Council in its own right as we are frequently overlooked by Shenstone Parish Council. Sometimes decisions can be made that are not best for Stonnall. A recent example is the mid-handling of the Youth and Community Hut which Shenstone P. C. tried to shut down. Fortunately, this was rescued after many months of trials and tribulations. Stonnall needs to be in charge of its own destiny."	N/A
237644	Shenstone	Grouping parishes under a common parish council or de-grouping parishes	"I believe the current set up is heavily weighted in favour of Shenstone and its residents, grants and funding never seem to come our way. Speed of vehicles on Wallheath Lane is an issue and has been for a long time, Shenstone only area with speed camera (van)"	"I believe the current set up is heavily weighted in favour of Shenstone and its residents, grants and funding never seem to come"
237654	Shenstone	Grouping parishes under a common parish council or de-grouping parishes	"Stonnall to have its own parish council"	"Living in Stonnall, having our parish merged with"

237655	Shenstone	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"Would like to have more say on what and how resources are allocated to improve all aspects relating to our village [stonnall], with residents of the village making the decisions"	N/A
237746	Shenstone	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"I would support a Parish Council that is totally focused on the village of Stonnall. It appears at times that we are the 'forgotten village'. If we had our own Parish, I strongly believe many more issues that are relevant to Stonnall will be regarded more seriously"	N/A
246274	Shenstone	Grouping parishes under a common parish council or de-grouping parishes	"It is important that the work of our Parish Council is local, and is seen to be local. Due to our rural position, if our Parish Council were any larger this work would seem remote; detached from the average parishioner and potentially lose support. Any smaller and we would not only see a reduction in available spend due to increased administration costs, but as there would naturally be fewer councillors, we would be in danger of creating personal fiefdoms and becoming parochial in outlook. In conclusion, I believe Shenstone Parish Council is a sensible combination of Shenstone, Stonnall and Little Aston wards, and from what I can see, is managed very effectively."	N/A
247597	Shenstone	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"Parish Councils are just "echo chambers" of like minded people arranging for new curtains in favoured organisations and ignoring any issue that requires thought. Shenstone Parish Council supports 5 village halls in Shenstone alone. They are issued annual grants. Parish councillors stay in post for 40years plus"	"The lack of accountability of Parish Councils. The lack of standards in representation of residents views"

249195	Shenstone	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"I totally oppose Stonnall creating a separate parish council. We have always been part of Shenstone parish council and there would be no benefit to Stonnall to change this. I am in total opposition to this proposal"	N/A
249871	Shenstone	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"SPC at the moment covers several wards. If one ward broke away it would be to the detriment of that ward, and the remaining group. There are a healthy mix of parish cllrs, and if a smaller PC was formed this may not happen. A smaller PC could easily be taken over by a single-issue group, which again would be detrimental to the PC. over by a single-issue group, which which again would be detrimental to the PC."	N/A
251360	Shenstone	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"I wish for the parish of Shenstone, Stonnall & Little Aston to remain. We have a clear identity as a neighbouring group of villages and are able to communicate our requirements effectively and we see great collaboration. Shenstone is part of our village identity. We do not wish for our village to be separated - we all benefit from the positive association with Shenstone. We also actively promote our village and undersubscribed primary school to Lichfield as an option for their children to attend as we reside in the catchment for The Friary so children who go to our wonderful primary can continue their learning journey with their friends into the Lichfield secondary school"	N/A
251451	Shenstone	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"We do not want Stonnall to be its own parish, we feel that it is best served in its current form, that is, as part of Shenstone Parish Council"	N/A

251459	Shenstone	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"I have heard that a few residents in Stonnall wish for the ward to become independent from Shenstone Parish Council. I and many other residents are whole heartedly against this. Over the last 10 years Stonnall has benefitted from much expenditure from the precept, to make it a safer and pleasant environment to live. Grant funding has been available for various projects and the village has enjoyed the results of the lengersmans regular work. The Clerk and Councillors are always approachable and the community spirit is enhanced by being part of the large Shenstone Parish."	N/A
253261	Shenstone	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"As Chairman of Shenstone Parish Council (SPC) I am aware of a petition in the village of Stonnall which was wrongly and deceptively headed as appearing to have come from Shenstone Parish Council and seeking support for the separation of Stonnall from SPC and become an independent Parish. (See attachment.) There seems to be a small amount of support but from reading the reasoning on the petition and the questions being asked but unanswered on local social media, there seems to be a lack of information and understanding of how much a Ward benefits from being part of a large Parish Council and of the implications and ramifications that would ensue to the detriment of the Stonnall community should that happen. Please take this submission as a vote to keep Stonnall as a Ward of SPC."	N/A

ENCLOSURE NO. 4 - APPENDIX A

253265	Shenstone	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"In response to the proposed Stonnall independence put forward by some residents, I would oppose this move. Evidence in the public domain such as minutes & newsletters give a clear representation that the Parish, including Stonnall, thrives as is. Indeed, it could be argued that Stonnall actually benefits more."	N/A
254098	Shenstone	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"The Shenstone Parish should stay as it is please, no break away parish."	N/A
254369	Shenstone	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"I am totally against the concept of an independent Stonnall and Lynn. I am very happy with the current situation and support the existing parish council structure."	N/A
254381	Shenstone	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"I fully support the current parish council structure and do not see any benefit from an independent Stonnall and Lynn. I am totally against any proposal to create an independent Stonnall and Lynn."	N/A
255060	Shenstone	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"I understand that there is a move to separate Stonnall and Lynn from Shenstone Parish council. as far as i can see ther will be no benefits to Stonnall to be separated from the larger Parish of Shenstone and therefore I would NOT support this move or suggestion."	N/A

255491	Shenstone	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"As Treasurer of Stonnall Village Hall and Chairman of Stonnall Playing Fields Association; these organisations have not been approached by the anonymous person who wishes make Stonnall an independent parish. I and my committee are vehemently opposed to any changes and want Stonnall to remain in Shenstone Parish Council. Talking to people in the village, it is obvious some have been coerced into signing a petition to take Stonnall out of the the SPC. Why would people support a cause when the supposed lead person will not put his name to the postings on Stonnall Matters or the petition!"	N/A
255555	Shenstone	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"I think Stonnall should stay part of the little Aston and Shenstone parish. Whybreak something that's working so well. The 3 names places are beautiful places to live and I believe its because of the good input off the group parishes."	"I think having access to a larger pot of funds is more benifit for Stonnall so leave things as they are please."
256509	Shenstone	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"I really don't think creating a separate parish council would be for the good of Stonnall, only for one councillor who would then ride roughshod over Stonnall residents wishes plus costs to residents would certainly increase"	N/A
256635	Shenstone	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"I am entirely against Stonnall splitting away and becoming self governing as I know for sure our rates would have to rise in order for us to maintain the same services that we have now. I think people backing the split have hidden agendas for wanting this and do not have residents interests at heart. I am a great believer in (if it's not broke don't fix it) and am more than happy with the way things are."	N/A

257745	Shenstone - On behalf of Parish Council	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"Shenstone Parish Council Response to the LDC 2022 Community Governance Review Shenstone Parish Council has agreed the statement of reasons below as the first consultation stage submission to Lichfield District Council. The Parish Council can see no substantive reason to adjust the existing Parish boundary which includes the villages of Shenstone, Stonnall and Little Aston and neighbouring hamlets. In making this submission the Parish Council has taken into consideration the four- community governance review key issues identified by the District Council. 1. The identities and interests of the community in the area. (i) The communities within the Parish Council area face very common issues. Protection of the Green Belt in this particular part of the District and County; commuter traffic pressures and hazards; appropriate forms of new private ownership and affordable village homes; maintenance and provision of services devolved from the County and District. These pressures and demands have been faced and managed effectively by the Parish Council. (ii) The three largest communities in the Parish each have a live Neighbourhood Plan which has been assembled out of extensive consultation and protects the individual priorities of each community and each is constantly supported by the Parish Council. There is a Parish Council commitment that following the approval of the latest LDC Local Plan all three will be refreshed with their communities (iii) Shenstone Parish Council has a strong record of actively pursuing appropriate membership from all three village communities to transparently maintain representation balance.	N/A
--------	---	--	--	-----

258878	Wall - Parish Clerk	The electoral arrangements for parishes (e.g. council size and parish warding)	"Community Governance Review Response Wall Parish Council discussed the Community Governance Review and its meeting on 15th March 2022 and resolved that it does not seek any changes to the current governance arrangements. A public forum was held at the meeting, and no alternative views were expressed. The current parish boundary has remained unchanged for over 40 years and so is a well established and recognisable boundary. The entire parish is within confirmed Green Belt, with almost no new development having taken place in that period, and no proposals for any forthcoming development in the District Council's Local Plan. As such, there are no development changes which would prompt a review of the parish boundary. The population of the parish is about 450, so there is no requirement for parish warding. The largest settlement is Wall village, which is surrounded by four much smaller hamlets of Chesterfield, Hilton, Muckley Corner and Pipehill, which look to Wall as the focus of the parish. Although the population of Wall makes it one of the smaller parishes in the District it has its own clear identity and a strong and active local community, centred on the thriving village hall and parish church. The Roman remains at Wall are a key visitor attraction, supported by a willing band of local volunteers. Community cohesion is also demonstrated by the forthcoming street party for the Queen's Platinum Jubilee, and the annual entry in the Staffordshire Best Kept Village competition. The council has seven members, which provides a firm basis for representing the views of residents, compatible with the population size. For at least the past 20 years the parish council has had a full complement of councillors with no unfilled vacancies, and there was a contested election to the most recent full council elections in May 2019. The parish council is active in promoting local facilities such as bus shelters (a new shelter will be erected in April), signposted walking routes in the parish, and a 'library' in a former phone box. Through an arrangement with Staffordshire County Council it undertakes highway verge cutting to provide a higher standard than would otherwise be obtained. In addition, it undertakes various maintenance and environmental work around the parish through the direct involvement of councillors, residents, and the council's lengthsman. The council submits comments on all planning applications in the parish and has recently been very active in supporting the concerns of Hilton residents about a large potato-grading development. There is a parish council website where agendas and minutes of meetings are available, together with financial information such as budgets and full details of council income and expenditure. Each council meeting has a public forum to enable residents to raise any concerns on local matters with councillors. The parish council therefore provides active and accountable local democracy for the parish and there is no reason to change these arrangements. The Council would ask that these views are taken into consideration in the forthcoming Community Governance Review and would be happy to provide any further information requested"	N/A
--------	---------------------	--	--	-----

252468	Weeford	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"Members of the Parish Council would like to keep the status quo and allow the Parish to continue. It is appreciated that the Parish has a small number of electors but covers a large area. Weeford would not benefit from a merger with an adjacent Parish"	N/A
253053	Whittington and Fisherwick, Parish Clerk	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"The Parish Council and its Councillors have discussed the Community Governance Review. It is considered that as we have a full complement of 15 Councillors, and have had so for some time, there will be no benefit in changing the current arrangements. There is a strong local community identity with the Parish Council and there is a lot of local participation in community events."	N/A

ENCLOSURE NO. 4 - APPENDIX A

258930	Wigginton and Hopwas - Parish Clerk	Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes	"The Parish Council recognises that the size of the Parish itself will increase significantly due to the Arkall Farm Development however also feel that even with the expanding population neither Wigginton or Hopwas are large enough to support a Parish Council in their own right. It has been difficult in the past decade or so to ensure all 7 seats on the are filled. Since employing a new clerk in November 2019, the Parish Council have introduced a Parish Council Action Plan and have reviewed all policies and procedures and have been working hard to increase community engagement across the Parish. We currently have 6 Councillors and have a prospective councillor to co- opt at our May meeting, ensuring we have the full complement. The Parish Council feel that the Parish should continue to include Comberford, Hopwas and Wigginton and that the number of seats (7) should also remain the same. There was no desire to split the Parish further or to merge with any other Parishes as we are already spread out geographically. It is felt that the status quo will continue to serve our needs for the coming years."	N/A
	Longdon - Parish Clerk		"I can confirm that Longdon Parish Council would like the councillor numbers reduced from 11 to 9 please"	

ENCLOSURE NO. 4 - APPENDIX A

Summary of Submissions for CGR Regarding Burntwood.

232224 Burntwood The electoral arrangements for parishes (e.g. council size and parish warding) "BTC not fit for purpose, delivers nothing of value, only interested in political point scoring, and should be disbanded or restructure, authority levels amended and potentially rolled into a district council."

233386 Burntwood and Hammerwich "Burntwood, that is the area administered at the local level by Burntwood Town Council and Hammerwich Parish. Burntwood wards are an historic anomaly, having mining or, farming, or open land as their defining character. Hammerwich is an anomaly in that it was a defined agricultural parish. Since the housing developments in Chase Terrace and Chasetown in response to the slum clearance programme in Birmingham and further developments of mixed housing in both parishes housing now defines a cohesive continuous urban area, which could be viewed the new parish of, "Burntwood and Hammerwich," or even, Greater Burntwood. The generation that still regards itself as belonging to either Hammerwich, Burntwood, Chasetown, Chase Terrace and Boney Hay will no longer be with us by the time the next Review occurs. The area as a unit needs recognition of its new status. The respective sizes of the areas of this, "Burntwood," and Lichfield as rapidly approaching population parity. Now is the time to enable the younger generation the time necessary for it to develop its unique economic, cultural and social identity ready for the second half of the twenty first century. "

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
HELD AT ST JOHN'S COMMUNITY CHURCH, HIGH STREET, CHASE TERRACE ON
THURSDAY 12 MAY 2022 COMMENCING AT 6.00 PM**

PRESENT

Councillor Flanagan [in the Chair]
Councillors Birch, D Ennis, L Ennis, Gittings, R Place and Willis-Croft

In attendance

Ms Minor, Deputy Clerk
Two members of the public

PUBLIC FORUM

No questions were raised by members of the public.

Councillor Flanagan thanked Councillor Birch for the sterling job he had done chairing the Planning and Development Committee meetings over the last few years. He confirmed that Councillor Birch had kindly offered to help and provide assistance in the future as he had good knowledge of planning law.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors Brown [dispensation], Bullock, Ho and Tapper.

2. GENERAL DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

Councillor Flanagan declared an interest in planning application 22/00479/FUH – 35 Morley Road as the applicant is known to him and took no part in the proceedings thereon.

Councillor L Ennis declared an interest in planning application 22/00479/FUH – 35 Morley Road as the applicant is known to her and took no part in the proceedings thereon.

The District Councillors present wished it to be recorded that their views were a preliminary view and one they may change when they hear all the evidence at the District Council's Planning Committee.

3. MINUTES

Councillor Flanagan confirmed that the Minutes had been approved at the Town Council meeting held on 11 May 2022.

It was proposed by Councillor D Ennis and seconded by Councillor R Place and following a unanimous show of hands it was

RESOLVED That the Minutes of the Planning and Development Committee Meeting held on 13 April 2022 [Minute Nos. 47-52] be approved as a correct record.

4. INFORMATION FROM THE MINUTES

Councillor Flanagan referred Members to planning application 21/01887/FUH – Green Lane Farm, Green Lane, Burntwood [retention of two storey extension to rear] and confirmed that following refusal by Lichfield District Council, as Local Planning Authority, an appeal had been made to the Planning Inspectorate. The appeal is to be decided in accordance with the fast-track appeal system, using only the original documentation sent to the Local Planning Authority.

5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

RESOLVED That the following comments be submitted to the Local Planning Authority:

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|---------------------|--|--|
| (a) | 22/00538/COU | Boney Hay & Central | Thatchmoor Investments Ltd
97 Rugeley Road
Chase Terrace | Change of use from small HMO [Use Class C4] to a large HMO [Sui Generis] |
|-----|--------------|---------------------|--|--|

No objection.

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| (b) | 22/00537/FUL | Summerfield & All Saints | K Smart
107 Springhill Road
Burntwood | Erection of 3 no. three bedroom dwellinghouses and associated works |
|-----|--------------|--------------------------|---|---|

STRONG OBJECTION due to the significant changes to the street scene, overcrowding of the buildings in an otherwise relatively open residential area as a result of the significant increase in the density of the dwellings. This will also impact on the amenity of the neighbours due to overlooking and loss of privacy.

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|--|---|---|
| (c) | 22/00459/FUL | | Aldi Stores Limited
Bridge Cross Road
Burntwood | Erection of CO2 refrigeration plant to replace existing refrigeration plant |
|-----|--------------|--|---|---|

No objection.

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|---------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| (d) | 22/00479/FUH | Boney Hay & Central | Mr M Gretton
35 Morley Road
Burntwood | Erection of log cabin to rear |
|-----|--------------|---------------------|---|-------------------------------|

No objection.

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|---------------|---|--|
| (e) | 22/00604/FUL | Chase Terrace | Mr J Beddow
68 Cannock Road
Chase Terrace | Variation of condition 3 [external materials] of 22/00113/FUH regarding rendering of the entire house and new garage |
|-----|--------------|---------------|---|--|

No objection.

- | | | | | |
|---------------|--------------|------------------|---|--|
| (f) | 22/00637/FUH | Chasetown | Mr K Owen
67 Willett Avenue
Burntwood | Erection of first floor
side extension |
| No objection. | | | | |
| (g) | 22/00640/FUL | Chase
Terrace | Mrs S Hill
45 Thorpe Street
Burntwood | Demolition of the
existing bungalow
and the erection of a
replacement
dwelling |
| No objection. | | | | |

6. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY [CIL] APPLICATION – CYCLE RACKS

Members considered in depth an application from Councillor Bullock on behalf of Burntwood Town Council in respect of Project 006 - Cycle Racks. It was hoped that the cycle racks would promote the better Burntwood image and be painted in the Town Council's 'green' colour and include our logo.

Councillor Birch stated that we needed to clarify with the Lichfield District Council that there is no requirement for planning permission. Members were informed that the Deputy Clerk had already contacted the District Council and was awaiting a response. Councillor D Ennis confirmed that as a District Councillor, he would chase up the matter and report back. He thought that it would depend on the size of the cycle racks whether planning permission was needed or not.

Councillor Birch suggested a meeting with the local police to ascertain the best locations for the bike racks [e.g. in front of CCTV points, well visible]. Councillor D Ennis confirmed that he had arranged a meeting with a PCSO in the near future to discuss the best locations for the cycle racks [off the public highway].

Councillor R Place said that he agreed in principle to the cycle racks, however, he asked whether a public consultation had taken place asking whether or not members of the public wanted them. Councillor Birch confirmed that the project had been discussed at the Planning Advisory Group [that Group includes representatives from organisations in the local community] and it had also been raised by the public in Councillors Surgeries. The cycle racks would create a sustainable town and their presence would generate use.

It was proposed by Councillor D Ennis and seconded by Councillor Birch and following a unanimous show of hands it was

RESOLVED That the application for Cycle Racks in the sum of £2,520 [from the Community Infrastructure Levy Fund] be approved.

7. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY [CIL] APPLICATION – BURNTWOOD HERITAGE TRAIL

Members considered in depth an application from Ms Williams on behalf of Friends of Burntwood Library in respect of Project 007 – Burntwood Heritage Trail. Councillor Birch explained that there was currently a heritage trail but this had fallen into disrepair. He supported the project which would reinvigorate the trail, focus on the town's heritage and increase health and wellbeing. However, he felt that the current

wording on the plaques was too small to read and the plaques on for example sides of houses needed to be more accessible/inclusive.

Councillor D Ennis explained that some of the plaques are missing and explained the concept of the project. He stated that the three historic heritage trail books were no longer available and the proposal would be to firstly produce a modernised heritage trail book with user-friendly maps that would be more suitable for all age ranges. Second on the list would be to replace missing plaques if possible and adding others as appropriate with more durable and time friendly Perspex signs/plaques rather than metal signs and thirdly, to research creating electronic versions of the book, using QR codes nearby sites linking to virtual trail/maps.

Councillor R Place queried the quality of the plaques and said that he would prefer to see a good quality metal one [cast iron] on someone's private property. He also queried whether the £5,000 would be adequate or would the Committee be asked to consider another CIL application further along the line. Councillor D Ennis confirmed that the Committee will not be expected to consider another application for funding for this project.

Councillor R Place also referred to the area of Hammerwich and their heritage and asked if Hammerwich could be included in the project. Councillor Birch pointed out that the CIL funding could only be used for project within the Parish of Burntwood and Hammerwich Parish Council would have their own pot of CIL monies.

Councillor Birch asked if local companies could be approached to perhaps sponsor the plaques and if the plaques could include the Town Council's logo in the bottom left corner.

Councillor D Ennis stated that he was also looking at funding from other sources [e.g. Lichfield District Council].

It was proposed by Councillor Birch and seconded by Councillor D Ennis and following a unanimous show of hands it was

RESOLVED That the application for a Burntwood Heritage Trail in the sum of £5,000 [from the Community Infrastructure Levy Fund] be approved.

[The Meeting closed 6.49 at pm]

Signed

Date

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
HELD AT CHASETOWN METHODIST CHURCH, LAWNSWOOD AVENUE, BURNTWOOD ON
TUESDAY 14 JUNE 2022 COMMENCING AT 6.00 PM**

PRESENT

Councillor Flanagan [in the Chair]
Councillors Banevicius, L Ennis, Gittings, R Place, Tapper and Willis-Croft

In attendance

Ms Minor, Deputy Clerk
Six members of the public

PUBLIC FORUM

Mrs Littlehales of Maple Close referred to planning application 22/00658/FULM – land at Maple Close and Sycamore Road [erection of 54 dwellings and associated landscaping, parking and access]. She explained to Members that Maple Close was currently a lovely quiet close consisting of private housing and the impact of the proposed development on its residents would be huge both in terms of noise, increased traffic and safety. She believed that opening up Maple Close was unnecessary and is to the detriment of its residents.

Mrs Littlehales stated that the plans and proposals that were shared with the residents prior to the public consultation event at Burntwood Library had all the proposed properties within the development accessed by one route going through the development between Maple Close and Sycamore Road. A lot of the feedback from the residents in Maple Close was that Maple Close should remain as a cul de sac as Maple Close is currently 5 metres wide and does not meet the advice of Staffordshire County Council who advise that should single access be provided to the development the access road should be 5.5 metres wide.

Mrs Littlehales pointed out that the planning statement [paragraph 2.6] refers to local housing properties being primarily two storey semi detached properties. She explained that this was factually incorrect as of 35 properties in Maple Close there are only six two storey semi-detached, the rest are either two storey detached or single storey detached bungalows. She referred to the infrastructure to support the proposed development with local health services and schools already struggling to keep up with the increased demand. She also pointed out that all vehicles onto the former Day Centre site had always accessed the site via the entrance points in Sycamore Road.

Mrs Littlehales hoped that the planning application would be refused so that further thought could be given to whether it is actually needed at this location and if it is, could it be achieved without opening up Maple Close.

8. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors Brown [dispensation], Birch, Bullock and D Ennis.

9. GENERAL DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

The District Councillors present wished it to be recorded that their views were a preliminary view and one they may change when they hear all the evidence at the District Council's Planning Committee.

10. MINUTES

It was proposed by Councillor R Place and seconded by Councillor L Ennis and following a unanimous show of hands it was

RESOLVED That the Minutes of the Planning and Development Committee Meeting held on 12 May 2022 [Minute Nos. 1-7] be approved as a correct record.

11. INFORMATION FROM THE MINUTES

Councillor Flanagan referred to planning application 22/00537/FUL in respect of 107 Springhill Road [erection of 3 no. three bedroom dwellinghouses and associated works] and informed Members that the application had been withdrawn.

12. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

RESOLVED That the following comments be submitted to the Local Planning Authority:

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|-------------|--|---|
| (a) | 22/00717/FUH | Gorstey Ley | Mrs J Roberts
52 Church Road
Burntwood | Erection of two
storey side and rear
extension and
single storey rear
extension |
|-----|--------------|-------------|--|---|

No objection in principle however the Planning Officer should be mindful of the comments made by Lichfield District Council's Conservation Officer.

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|---------|--|--|
| (b) | 22/00761/FUH | Hunslet | Mr A Thorpe
Avalon
Bramble Lane
Burntwood | Erection of two
storey extension to
facilitate single
dwelling from 2 no.
detached dwellings |
|-----|--------------|---------|--|--|

No objection in principle however the Planning Officer should be mindful of the comments made by Lichfield District Council's Arboricultural Officer.

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| (c) | 22/00681/OUT | Summerfield
and All Saints | Mr P Fisher
Land adjacent to
18 Summerfield Road
Burntwood | Outline application
for the erection of 3
no. two bedroom
houses |
|-----|--------------|-------------------------------|---|---|

OBJECTION due to the significant changes to the street scene and the additional congestion this development would cause.

Even though it is not a planning consideration, Members raised concerns, following a comment made on LDC's planning portal by a member of the public, regarding the legal ownership of the land in question.

Members were advised that District Councillor L Ennis would be calling in this application.

- | | | | | |
|-----|---------------|-----------|---|---|
| (d) | 22/00658/FULM | Chasetown | Bromford Housing Association
Land at
Maple Close and
Sycamore Road | Erection of 54 dwellings and associated landscaping, parking and access |
|-----|---------------|-----------|---|---|

STRONG OBJECTION due to the infrastructure of access point via Maple Close. [Road only being 5 metres wide and not meeting the advice of Staffordshire County Council who advise that should single access be provided to the development the access road should be 5.5 metres wide] and comments made by Staffordshire County Council's Flood Risk Officer, who recommends planning permission is not granted. The Town Council is mindful to change its view if further consideration is given to access and egress via Sycamore Road utilising existing drive way thus avoiding removal of the hedge and not having traffic entering the site via Maple Close cul de sac.

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|-----------------------|--|---|
| (e) | 22/00801/FUH | Boney Hay and Central | Mrs K Birks
30 Deerfold Crescent
Burntwood | Erection of single storey extension to front and rear and replacement pitched roofs to existing first floor dormers |
|-----|--------------|-----------------------|--|---|

No objection.

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|---------------|--|--|
| (f) | 22/00826/FUH | Chase Terrace | Mr and Mrs Derby
2A Kingsdown Road
Burntwood | First floor rear extension to form bedroom with en-suite |
|-----|--------------|---------------|--|--|

No objection however the Planning Officer should be mindful that the extension does not impact on the amenity of the neighbours by way of overlooking and loss of privacy.

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|---------|---|--|
| (g) | 22/00657/FUH | Hunslet | Mr D Tunnicliff
9 Wilkinson Close
Burntwood | Erection of first floor side extension |
|-----|--------------|---------|---|--|

No objection in principle however the Planning Officer should be mindful of the comments made by Lichfield District Council's Arboricultural Officer.

13. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Councillor Flanagan referred to the Terms of Reference and explained that the composition had changed to 12 elected Members.

RESOLVED That the Terms of Reference be received and noted.

[The Meeting closed 6.54 at pm]

Signed

Date

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
HELD IN THE MEETING ROOM, BURNTWOOD LIBRARY, BRIDGE CROSS ROAD,
BURNTWOOD ON MONDAY 11 JULY 2022 COMMENCING AT 6.00 PM**

PRESENT

Councillor Flanagan [in the Chair]
Councillors Banevicius, Bullock, D Ennis, R Place, Tapper and Willis-Croft

In attendance

Ms Minor, Deputy Clerk
One member of the public

PUBLIC FORUM

Mr Steve Jones, Chairman of Chasetown Football Club referred to planning application 22/00843/FULM [demolition of buildings and structures to allow for the extension and refurbishment of the existing club house for sport and community use and replacement of existing covered seating stand, minor engineering works and landscaping]. He explained that the development forms part of a broader plan to help the club continue climbing the non-league pyramid and that the club had just won the Grassroots Club of the Year Award. He stated that the club had invested heavily and that hours of hard work and dedication had been put in, the club is ambitious to bring in new groups currently not making use of the facilities by removing any physical or cultural barriers providing easy access for the whole community. The proposed redevelopment of the clubhouse will not only bring in current building standards in relation to energy saving and sustainability, but also provide facilities for the wider community. The proposal would put the Town on the map and provide a sense of community.

14. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors Brown [dispensation], L Ennis, Gittings and Ho.

15. GENERAL DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

The District Councillors present wished it to be recorded that their views were a preliminary view and one they may change when they hear all the evidence at the District Council's Planning Committee.

16. MINUTES

It was proposed by Councillor D Ennis and seconded by Councillor Banevicius and following a unanimous show of hands it was

RESOLVED That the Minutes of the Planning and Development Committee Meeting held on 14 June 2022 [Minute Nos. 8-13] be approved as a correct record.

17. INFORMATION FROM THE MINUTES

Councillor Flanagan referred to planning application 22/00681/OUT - Land adjacent to 18 Summerfield Road [outline application for the erection of 3 no. two bedroom houses] and informed Members that the application had been withdrawn on 14 June 2022.

Councillor Flanagan referred to planning application 22/00826/FUH – 2A Kingsdown Road [erection of first floor rear extension to form bedroom with en-suite] and informed Members that amended plans had been received. Following a telephone conversation with James Hyde, Planning Officer, LDC the Deputy Clerk had obtained information that the proposal has now been reduced in size which now comes under permitted development. It was **AGREED** that the same comment would be submitted – No objection however the Planning Officer should be mindful that the extension does not impact on the amenity of the neighbours by way of overlooking and loss of privacy.

Members raised concerns regarding the proposed development on land adjacent to 18 Summerfield Road and the fact that the neighbour consultation responses in respect of the withdrawn application have now disappeared from the planning portal. They asked whether neighbours were aware of the withdrawal and the amended plans now submitted. It was **AGREED** that the Deputy Clerk would email Clare Saint, Planning Officer, LDC to ascertain if neighbours have been consulted on the amended plans and if their previous consultation responses are considered when determining the new application.

18. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

RESOLVED That the following comments be submitted to the Local Planning Authority:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| (a) | 22/00829/FUH | Boney Hay and Central | Ms S Clarke
178 Rugeley Road
Chase Terrace | Erection of new boundary fencing and hardstanding |
| No objection. | | | | |
| (b) | 22/00846/FUH | Gorstey Ley | Mr J Challoner
67 Rugeley Road
Burntwood | Erection of first floor front extension |
| No objection. | | | | |
| (c) | 22/00810/COU | Chase Terrace | Mr J Bradshaw
Land south of Sevens Road
Rugeley Road
Chase Terrace | Change of use of land to equestrian use [retrospective] |
| No objection as long as the Local Planning Authority ensures that the site is fit and safe for the purpose of equestrian use. | | | | |
| (d) | 22/00897/FUH | Chase Terrace | Mr I Clegg
54 Railway Lane
Burntwood | Single storey rear and side extension to form kitchen and garage |

No objection.

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| (e) | 22/00836/FUL | Boney Hay and Central | Mr J Darnley
6 Birch Terrace
Burntwood | Erection of a detached dwelling with garage and associated works |
|-----|--------------|-----------------------|--|--|

No objection.

- | | | | | |
|-----|---------------|-----------|--|---|
| (f) | 22/00843/FULM | Chasetown | Chasetown FC [2021] Ltd
Chasetown Football Club
Church Street
Burntwood | Demolition of buildings and structures to allow for the extension and refurbishment of the existing club house for sport and community use and replacement of existing covered seating stand, minor engineering works and landscaping |
|-----|---------------|-----------|--|---|

The Committee fully supports this application.

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| (g) | 22/00921/OUT | Summerfield and All Saints | Mr P Fisher
Land adjacent to
18 Summerfield Road
Burntwood | Outline application for the erection of 1 no. three bedroom dwelling and 1 no. two bedroom bungalow |
|-----|--------------|----------------------------|---|---|

OBJECTION due to the significant changes to the street scene and the additional congestion this development would cause [safety aspects with regard to the parking down one side of the street].

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|-----------|--|--|
| (h) | 22/00961/FUH | Highfield | Mrs K Jackson
3 Cheshire Close
Burntwood | Alterations to garage to facilitate part-conversion to bedroom and shower room |
|-----|--------------|-----------|--|--|

No objection.

[The Meeting closed at 6:38 pm]

Signed

Date

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE
HELD IN THE MEETING ROOM, BURNTWOOD LIBRARY,
BRIDGE CROSS ROAD, BURNTWOOD
ON WEDNESDAY 08 JUNE 2022 COMMENCING AT 6.00 PM**

PRESENT

Councillor Norman [in the Chair]

Councillors Birch, D Ennis, Evans, Flanagan, Ho, R Place, Westwood and Woodward.

In attendance

S Lightfoot, Town Clerk

Ms J Minor, Deputy Town Clerk

PUBLIC FORUM

No questions were raised by members of the public.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors M Place, Tapper and Taylor.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND DISPENSATIONS

Councillor Flanagan declared a non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 5 – Schedule of Payments and in particular payments made to Burntwood Community Seed Share in that his wife set up the seed share and he is an admin on their Facebook site.

3. MINUTES

The Chair reminded Members that they were being asked to comment solely on the accuracy of the Minutes.

It was proposed by Councillor Woodward and seconded by Councillor D Ennis and following a unanimous show of hands it was

RESOLVED That the Minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee held on 29 March 2022 [Minute Nos. 20-27] be approved as a correct record.

4. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Councillor Woodward felt that under the heading of Responsibilities – No. 9 this should be moved to No. 1 in the list because to develop and review the strategy of the Council, identify the vision, aims and objectives and present these within the Town Strategy was key. She said that in respect of the current No. 1, a clear picture (schedule) was needed of when policies, contracts etc were due to be reviewed/ renewed. The Town Clerk confirmed that there was a maintenance and contract schedule already in place however, the Town Council's Policies Review Timetable is being reviewed.

Councillor Woodward, under the heading of Responsibilities – No. 6 felt that certain consultations should be delegated to Committees as these could be time restricted. Under the heading of Governance – Nos. 4 & 5, she felt that more clarification was needed.

Councillor Norman felt that a schedule of programmes was needed and the Town Clerk confirmed that a Forward Plan will be circulated to Members regularly.

Councillor R Place asked does the Committee make the decision and Full Council just approve it or can Full Council over rule.

Councillor Birch felt that under delegated powers the Committee should set a spend limit for say general housekeeping however, big capital projects should be discussed in full. Councillor Woodward felt that with a scheme of delegation more things can be moved along more quickly (where provision has already been provided within the revenue budget).

RESOLVED That taking into the comments, the Town Clerk to review the Terms of Reference/Delegation for the Committee and to report back to a future meeting.

5. SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS

Councillor Norman referred to the payment made to Lichfield District Council and informed Members that the Trees Inspection was every three years.

Councillor Ho queried the payment made to Flowers By Claudine – Gift and the Town Clerk confirmed that this was for the outgoing Chair for her services to the Town Council over the last couple of years.

Councillor Ho referred to the payments made to CityLife Magazine and the Town Clerk confirmed that the April Edition was for a double page and the May Edition was for a single page. He confirmed that the Town Council would be advertising monthly going forward. Councillor Norman informed Members that he had received information from the Town Clerk which stated the circulation figure in Burntwood was around 3,000 per month (and this does include parts of Hammerwich). In Burntwood, the magazine goes to the St Matthews Estate and the Stables Way Estate. They also drop it off at locations such as Post Offices, the Library and the Old Mining College.

Councillor R Place stated that he was pleased that we were now using CityLife Magazine as he felt that there had been some negativity from the other side of the chamber however, Councillor Woodward disputed this and reminded Councillor R Place that CityLife Magazine representatives had been invited to a Town Council Meeting on 12 March 2020.

Councillor Flanagan stated that even though he lived on the Stables Way Estate he had never received a copy of the CityLife Magazine and it would be useful to know exactly where the magazines are delivered to. Councillor Evans agreed with Councillor Flanagan and said that areas delivered to needed to be identified. Councillor R Place also confirmed that he did not receive a copy in Hammerwich.

Councillor Ho suggested perhaps putting in a competition into the magazine to gauge interest. The Town Clerk confirmed that in the June Edition there will be a "Sunflower Competition for Ukraine".

Councillor Westwood asked what was the criteria for success - is the trial for 6 months or 12 months? It was **AGREED** that the Town Clerk would report back to the October 2022 meeting.

Councillor Woodward asked if an answer had been received from the Internal Auditor regarding reporting of minimal amounts and the Town Clerk confirmed that he had yet to receive a definitive answer.

RESOLVED That the payments from 03 May 2022 to 31 May 2022 in the sum of £26,977.84 be approved.

6. UPGRADE OF TRAFFIC ISLAND PLANTING

Councillor Norman confirmed that he, together with the Town Clerk, had recently met with Gary Brownridge, Operational Services Manager, Lichfield District Council to find a way forward for making a "Brighter Burntwood".

Councillor Woodward pointed out that previously Councillor Birch had suggested public art pieces could be installed onto the traffic islands.

Members were informed that currently the traffic islands reflected Cannock Chase (birch trees, heathers etc) and it was the intention to bring more flowers/colour to the traffic islands however this needed to be in keeping with the scale of the traffic islands.

RESOLVED That Councillor Norman and the Town Clerk continue to investigate the possibility of a "Brighter Burntwood".

7. BUS SHELTERS

Chase Road

Members were informed that the concrete shelter on Chase Road had been removed. The Town Clerk confirmed that Staffordshire County Council had removed the shelter as they had determined it was unsafe and dangerous.

Councillor Norman felt that due to space available the bus shelter outside of Burntwood Park which includes the Town Council's logo and a seat may be appropriate for this location.

Councillor D Ennis confirmed that the bus stop was well used however he would prefer to see a wooden shelter [with seating but no sides] which he felt would be more in keeping with the location as there were two wooden shelters on Chase Road.

Councillor Norman informed Members of current statistics with regard to the use of buses and Councillor R Place stated that as the statistics show that bus journeys are reducing it is worth spending the money. Councillor Birch acknowledged that bus usage was declining however he felt that we should be encouraging the use of public transport by making it easier to access. Councillor Evans felt that we needed to consider who was using the buses, perhaps less mobile people where seating would be beneficial.

RESOLVED The Town Clerk would obtain quotations for a metal shelter and a wooden shelter together with maintenance costs.

Rugeley Road, Chase Terrace

Councillor Woodward referred to a previous decision made by the Town Council regarding a bus stop outside Nos. 184-186 Rugeley Road, Chase Terrace. She said that a letter was sent to residents in January 2021 stating that the Town Council, in partnership with Staffordshire County Council, would shortly be funding the hard surfacing of the area immediately around the bus stop. Currently it is grass which is not an ideal surface during wet weather. The intention was to pave the area. Councillor Woodward pointed out that this had not been done. A quotation was obtained for the works in question however this is now out of date and Mary Lee from Staffordshire County Council is in the process of arranging for another quotation to be provided.

Councillor Birch felt that if a decision had already been made by the Town Council then this should be carried out. Councillor D Ennis felt that the work could be carried out by BRRT (Burntwood Response & Repair Team).

RESOLVED The Town Clerk would obtain quotations for the work and that the work be completed at the earliest opportunity.

8. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED That under the Public Bodies (Admissions of Meeting) Act 1960 (Section 2) (and as expended by Section 100 of the Local Government Act 1972), the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information.

9. CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES

See Confidential Minutes.

10. PROPOSED PUBLIC CONVENIENCES

See Confidential Minutes.

11. SUPPORT FOR DEMENTIA FRIENDLY COMMUNITY

See Confidential Minutes.

12. INSURANCE RENEWAL

See Confidential Minutes.

13. INVESTMENT IN CHASE TERRACE PARK

See Confidential Minutes.

14. UPDATE ON BURIAL GROUNDS

See Confidential Minutes.

[The Meeting closed at 7.55 pm]

Signed

Date

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY AND PARTNERSHIPS COMMITTEE
HELD AT BURNTWOOD LIBRARY, BRIDGE CROSS ROAD, BURNTWOOD ON
WEDNESDAY 22 JUNE 2022 COMMENCING AT 6.00 PM**

PRESENT

Councillor D Ennis [in the Chair]
Councillors Bishop, Coe, Evans, Gittings, M Place and R Place

In attendance

S Lightfoot, Town Clerk
Ms J Minor, Deputy Clerk

LICHFIELD DISTRICT CITY OF SANCTUARY

Mr Nigel Gann, Secretary of the Lichfield District City of Sanctuary gave a talk on how the Town Council could work with and support Lichfield District City of Sanctuary. He explained that the Lichfield District City of Sanctuary is a Charitable Incorporated Organisation [CIO] but emphasised that the organisation does not just cover Lichfield but the whole of the district.

Mr Gann stated that their strategy key messages were

- Engagement with existing refugees
- Challenging divisive behaviour
- Developing streams of sanctuary

Mr Gann explained that their aspirations were

- To become known in Burntwood and the villages as a District City of Sanctuary
- To provide their services in Burntwood and the villages as well as in Lichfield
- To create partnerships with Burntwood organisations with shared values and objectives
- To have a formal relationship with Burntwood Town Council as a means of achieving this
- To see Burntwood as a Town of Sanctuary

He explained that they already have relationships with Lichfield District Council, in particular Councillor Richard Cox, Cabinet Member for Communities and Partnerships and Lichfield City Council who at their meeting on 14 March 2022 resolved to support the vision and principles of the organisation.

Councillor D Ennis felt that the minimum that the Town Council could do was to match the resolution of the City Council and appoint Councillor representatives.

Councillor Evans referred to the "We Stand With Ukraine" event held in the Memorial Park on Saturday 12 March and felt that it was vital for refugees to learn the language in order to integrate.

Councillor M Place said that she would be attending the AGM on Saturday 25 June. Councillor Coe explained that she attended [via zoom] the 08 June Faith Action Coffee House which focused on Faith's Response to the Crisis in Ukraine.

It was proposed by Councillor D Ennis and seconded by Councillor Evans and following a show of hands [5 For, 1 Abstention] it was

RESOLVED That

- (a) The Town Council declares its support for the vision and principles of Lichfield District City of Sanctuary.
- (b) The Town Council appoints up to three representatives as Burntwood Town Council representatives on this outside body until May 2023, then for a period of two years.

PUBLIC FORUM

No questions were raised by members of the public.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors Greensill, Kirkham, Ho, Taylor and Woodward.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND DISPENSATIONS

None declared.

3. MINUTES

The Chair reminded Members that they were being asked to comment solely on the accuracy of the Minutes.

It was proposed by Councillor M Place and seconded by Councillor Evans and following a unanimous show of hands it was

RESOLVED That the Minutes of the Community and Partnerships Committee held on 19 April 2022 [Minute Nos. 65-74] be approved as a correct record.

4. INFORMATION FROM THE MINUTES

There was no information arising from the minutes.

5. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Councillor M Place explained that Everyone Health would be coming to Morrisons in August. They provide free 12-week programmes which include adult weight management, stop smoking, stop smoking in pregnancy, physical activity sessions, falls prevention, loneliness and social isolation service. They also provide free NHS health checks for anyone living in Staffordshire between ages 40-74.

Councillor Evans referred to Dementia Friendly Community and the importance of getting local businesses on board. Information sheets have been produced which can be given out to local businesses. She confirmed that all hairdressers in Burntwood had been given the information sheet as it is important to make as many people as possible aware and it was important to keep the message going. She also referred to the walk being organised by Councillor Woodward in September. Councillor Evans

mentioned that Caroline Bruno, Scheme Manager for MHA Communities may be organising a scarecrow competition.

Councillor R Place stated as a point of order, queried the decision made in respect of Lichfield District City of Sanctuary in front of Mr Gann, as he felt that the speaker should have left the room which would have then allowed a debate. He stated that he was not against the idea but the way it was conducted.

6. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE COMMUNITY AND PARTNERSHIPS COMMITTEE

Councillor R Place referred to the Policy and Resources Committee meeting held on 08 June 2022 where their terms of reference was discussed and in particular Responsibilities No. 7.

The Town Clerk referred to Governance No. 5 and explained that he would be asking the Chair and Vice Chair to set a spending limit however, Councillor R Place felt that where provision had already been provided within the revenue budget there was no need for a spending limit.

It was proposed by Councillor R Place and seconded by Councillor D Ennis and following a unanimous show of hands it was

RESOLVED That the Terms of Reference for the Committees be referred to the next meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee scheduled for 10 August 2022.

7. BURNTWOOD WAKES PLATINUM JUBILEE CELEBRATION EVENT 2022

Councillor Evans felt that the event had been excellent and due to the windy weather the stalls had been located in the hall which was better for them. She felt that the event went smoothly and it was important that the event was free to reflect hardship faced by families at the moment.

Councillor Coe agreed with Councillor Evans that it was important that children could go on the inflatable, climbing wall for free as people were on a limited budget.

Councillor D Ennis stated that the Town Council tried something different this year with the climbing wall and cave which proved popular as the fairground rides were double/triple the price. It was unfortunate that there was several other events going on in other local areas, but this was inevitable. There was really good talent on the stage throughout the day.

Councillor R Place felt that it was easy for people to criticise but this was a unique event but the Town Council needed to be careful of the budget in the future. Councillor D Ennis confirmed that he had already had discussions with the Chair [Councillor Taylor] as the budget will be half next year. The budget for this event was unspent monies from previous years.

8. MARKETS

Councillor D Ennis suggested that this item be removed from the agenda as the markets are running well. They are well attended and the Town Council gazebo gives Councillors an opportunity to speak to members of the public direct.

It was suggested that Review of Markets could go on the 19 October agenda as the Markets would have just been completed.

9. PLAY IN THE PARKS 2022

The Town Clerk confirmed that the events were progressing rapidly and it was hoped that the Town Council would again be working in partnership with Spark, Beacon Community Church, St John's Community Church and Fun Club. The events will be held across the town on Mondays and Wednesday from 25 July to 24 August and will be advertised in CityLife Magazine and on Social Media.

The Town Clerk confirmed that the Town Council had obtained some free play equipment via the scheme currently run by Lichfield District Council – Community Park Play Initiative.

Councillor M Place confirmed that she would provide details for the SPACE scheme.

Councillor D Ennis suggested that the Town Council may need to review its marketing strategy and said that he uses a paid advert on Facebook. He asked if the Town Clerk could look into when the decision was made to use CityLife Magazine.

Councillor Evans stated that every household had received an event calendar.

10. CHRISTMAS EVENTS

The Town Clerk confirmed that the event was progressing and childrens funfair rides had already been booked.

With regard to the request from Burntwood Action Group for them to be included in the Town Council's annual funding for festive trees, the Town Clerk confirmed that Gary Brownridge, Operational Services Manager, Lichfield District Council had visited the site to see what the feasibility was. Mr Brownridge confirmed that Burntwood Action Group have a stand which could accommodate any size trunk base on a 10ft tree. The Town Clerk confirmed that this could be accommodated within the current budget.

Councillor D Ennis supported the festive tree within the Ward as long as the Town Council get a recognition [in the terms and conditions].

Councillor R Place felt that the Town Council needed to be careful even though he supported the suggestion, this was from a right leaning group. The Town Clerk thought that this was an opportunity to engage with local groups.

Councillor Evans thought that all festive trees sponsored/provided by Burntwood Town Council had to have recognition on them [for example Christmas Tree provided by Burntwood Town Council].

It was proposed by Councillor D Ennis and seconded by Councillor Evans and following a unanimous show of hands it was

RESOLVED That a 10ft festive tree to be located in Prince's Park be included in the Town Council's annual funding for festive trees.

11. BETTER BURNTWOOD FUND – MIDLAND SOCCER ACADEMY

Councillor R Place raised some concerns and asked if this was a charity as the Club takes "subs". Councillor D Ennis said that the Town Clerk needed to check that this was a community interest company and not a corporate business.

Councillor M Place also raised concerns regarding setting a precedent for all clubs to apply for new kits and Councillor Coe queried membership numbers. The Deputy Clerk confirmed that they currently have approximately 60 members [approximately 15-25 each session] and they are open to everyone aged 50+.

It was proposed by Councillor Evans and seconded by Councillor R Place and following a unanimous show of hands it was

RESOLVED That on the basis that it fits the criteria then a grant of £500 be awarded to Midland Soccer Academy.

12. BETTER BURNTWOOD FUND – MHA COMMUNITIES SOUTH STAFFORDSHIRE

Councillor R Place hoped that there would not be too many Better Burntwood Fund applications to just be ratified in the future by this Committee. Councillor D Ennis explained that due to time restraints and the Committee now only meeting every two months, there will be applications that will just need ratifying.

It was proposed by Councillor M Place and seconded by Councillor Evans and following a unanimous show of hands it was

RESOLVED That due to time restraints, under Chair's discretion, the application for funding from MHA Communities South Staffordshire in the sum of £500 be ratified.

13. BETTER BURNTWOOD FUND – FUN CLUB

It was proposed by Councillor M Place and seconded by Councillor Evans and following a unanimous show of hands it was

RESOLVED That a grant of £500 be awarded to Fun Club.

14. LICHFIELD CITY OF SANCTUARY

See above discussion and resolution.

15. INFORMATION OR ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING

None reported.

[The Meeting closed at 7.33 pm]

Signed

Date