

STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS DISTRICT COUNCIL

SERVICE DELIVERY OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PANEL MEETING

Minutes

WEDNESDAY, 18 NOVEMBER 2020

PRESENT: Councillor R Ward (Chair)

Councillors J Aberley, G Bentley, C Brady, B Emery, K Flunder, A Hart, N Hawkins, I Herdman, K Hoptroff, L Page, D Price, J Redfern, P Roberts, J Salt and H Sheldon MBE

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor B Johnson, I Plant, J T Jones, P Routledge, K Martin, S Scalise, L A Malyon, M Bowen, S E Ralphs MBE, P Wilkinson, M Gledhill, M A Deaville, J Porter and K J Jackson

APOLOGIES: Councillors H Plimley and I Whitehouse

19 **NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS, IF ANY.**

Councillor Wilkinson substituted for Councillor Whitehouse.

20 **TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING.**

DECIDED – That the minutes of the meeting of the Panel held on 16 September 2020 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

21 **URGENT ITEMS OF BUSINESS, IF ANY. (24 HOURS NOTICE TO BE PROVIDED TO THE CHAIRMAN).**

There were none.

22 **DECLARATION OF INTERESTS:-**

Agenda Item	Member Declaring Interest	Nature of Interest
Agenda Item 8 – Call-in of Cheadle Town Centre Projects.	Cllr Aberley	Other – Owns a property on Charles Street, Cheadle.
	Cllr Wilkinson	Other – Owns properties on High Street, Cheadle.

Service Delivery Overview & Scrutiny Panel - 18 November 2020

Agenda Item	Member Declaring Interest	Nature of Interest
	Cllr Routledge	Other – Wife works at Cheadle Hospital.

23 QUESTIONS TO PORTFOLIO HOLDERS, IF ANY.

Question Received from Councillor Price:

“Could I please have confirmation that Councillor Wain has repaid the full cost of the creation and subsequent removal of the 'Council Permit Holder Only' space in Silk Street Car Park?”

Response from Councillor Wain – Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development & Property:

“I have repaid the full cost of £545 + VAT regarding Silk Street Car Park. I stated that I would repay this sum at the last meeting of the Panel and I have honoured that commitment.”

As a supplementary question, Councillor Price asked what had been done to prevent individual Portfolio Holders making similar decisions in the future. In response, Councillor Ralphs advised that checks were in place and prior to any decisions being made, they would be discussed with her and other colleagues.

24 ALLIANCE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT & PRESENTATION

The Panel received an Alliance Environmental Services annual performance presentation from Kevin Melling and Jane Thomason. The topics covered included:-

- Financial Summary
- 2020/21 Saving Plan Update
- High Level Draft Management Fee 2021/22
- Contractual Key Performance Indicators
- Service Update
- Response to Covid-19
- Strategic Outlook

The Chair thanked the Officers for the comprehensive update which contained many positive aspects, particularly during the difficulties attributed to Covid-19. Members also congratulated the staff for the excellent service they provided to residents.

Members sought clarification around environmental plans for the company, the recycling target, bin loss, application for assisted collections, sound on electric vehicles, fly-tipping and gender balance of the workforce.

In reply, the Officers agreed to include environmental actions/ impact/ambitions in future updates, electric vehicles had the ability to have noise for a safety measure, new equipment would help to reduce loss of bins and the application for assisted collections would be reviewed by the Council's Commissioning Team.

Service Delivery Overview & Scrutiny Panel - 18 November 2020

It was acknowledged that a more joined up approach to prosecution of fly-tipping could be taken. Gender balance was important to the company and further information on this would be reported at a future meeting.

Discussion also took place around improved understanding of what can be placed into each bin, electric and hydrogen powered vehicles, destination of plastics and recruitment agencies.

A specific issue with health and safety of residents during the winter months would be discussed outside of the meeting.

DECIDED: That the presentation be received.

25 CALL-IN OF THE CABINET REPORT - CHEADLE TOWN CENTRE PROJECTS

Cabinet members had considered a report which outlined proposals for the establishment of a Cheadle Town Centre Delivery Board, supported by a Stakeholder Panel, to oversee development and delivery of town centre projects including options appraisal for the emerging Cheadle town centre Masterplan and the High Streets Task Force programme of activity. The report also provided an update on progress with regards to the Cheadle Town Centre Options Appraisal Report and the High Streets Task Force and sought to agree next steps.

The decision made was: -

1. That the proposals for the establishment of a Cheadle Town Centre Delivery Board and Stakeholder Panel, as set out in the report be approved;
2. That the progress on current Cheadle town centre projects be noted.

Following this decision, call-in requests had been received from Councillors: - L. Malyon, P. Wilkinson, K. Martin, I. Whitehouse, I. Plant and G. Bentley.

The call-in request confirmed the following principles of decision making which they believed had not been adhered to:

- taking due regard of all relevant considerations and disregarding irrelevant considerations;
- proportionality (i.e. the action will be proportionate to the desired outcome);
- respect for human rights and equalities;
- a presumption in favour of openness; and
- clarity of aims and desired outcomes.

Members debated in detail the points raised both in the Cabinet report and the Call-in. Key points being:-

- The hospital was vital to serve the increased population, many services were provided from the site which included one of the trials for a Covid-19 vaccination.

Service Delivery Overview & Scrutiny Panel - 18 November 2020

- Cheadle Leisure Centre was an excellent facility and had received funding from the community, it was well attended by various clubs and disability swim sessions were accessed from this pool.
- A document dated 2009 within the masterplan for Cheadle, stated that there were no alternative sites for car parking in the town centre so therefore, it would not be possible to develop the Tape Street Car Park.
- A 45 minute town centre site tour snapshot analysis of Cheadle was not acceptable.
- Members were pleased that Cheadle was being considered for investment, however, there were concerns as this had been promised previously - but little had been delivered in terms of regeneration.
- There was concern around prescriptive options being contained within the report, prior to any consultation being carried out with residents.
- Tourism should be taken into account and it was suggested that a site for a hotel in the town was considered as part of the project.
- For Cabinet to include a councillor from Cheadle and more involvement with Cheadle Town Council to help resolve communication issues.
- A suggestion that the Stakeholder Panel and Cheadle Town Centre Delivery Board should be one entity.

Generally, members agreed that Cheadle required investment and were not against the projects but thought that the options for consideration should be removed from the report and led by the residents/businesses of Cheadle.

In response, Councillor Ralphs gave assurance that the projects hadn't commenced and therefore no recommendations had been made. She re-iterated the importance of consultation with the residents of Cheadle and that Cheadle Hospital was not in the ownership of SMDC. Cheadle Town Centre Projects gave the opportunity for the town to receive investment and for improvements to be made, which would benefit the community.

Other members were also in agreement that Cheadle required investment and it was important that the projects were not delayed.

The matter was then put to a named vote as follows:-

In favour of the Call-in:

Councillors: Bentley, Brady, Hawkins, Hoptroff, Page, Price, Salt and Wilkinson (substitute for Whitehouse) (8)

Against the Call-in:

Councillors: Aberley, Emery, Hart, Herdman, Roberts, Sheldon and Ward (7)

Abstentions:

Councillor: Flunder (1)

In accordance with the procedure for consideration of Call-ins at Overview & Scrutiny Panel meetings, where the Panel decided (by a vote) to refer back a decision to Cabinet for reconsideration, Cabinet would now reconsider within a further 10 working days, amending the decision or not, before adopting a final decision.

Service Delivery Overview & Scrutiny Panel - 18 November 2020

26 **WORK PROGRAMME**

The Panel considered its Work Programme and agreed the items listed, subject to, an item being added on Street Assets (Bus Shelters).

DECIDED: That the Work Programme for 2012-21 be agreed.

27 **EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC.**

“That pursuant to Section 100A (2) and (4) of the Local Government Act, 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or nature of the proceedings whereby it is likely that exempt information as defined in Section 100A (3) of the Act would be disclosed to the public in breach of the obligation of confidence or exempt information as defined in Section 100I (1) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act would be disclosed to the public by virtue of the paragraphs indicated.”

28 **TO APPROVE THE EXEMPT MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING.**

DECIDED – That the exempt minutes of the meeting of the Panel held on 16th September 2020 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

The meeting closed at 9.30 pm

_____Chairman _____Date