

## Shropshire Charter – Summary of Consultation Responses Received

40 Responses were received during the consultation period.

TPCs = Town and Parish Councils

SC = Shropshire Council

Parish	Summary of Comments Made	Response
Wroxeter and Uppington PC	<p>Fully supportive of this initiative.</p> <p>Concerned about timescales allowed for consultations for small parishes.</p> <p>Not all councillors on email and cost of copying and mailing is excessive for small councils.</p>	
Shrewsbury Town Council	<p>Acknowledges a one size fits all Charter is difficult to produce.</p> <p>As a large local council would like to see the following:</p> <p>A more participative role in the vision of the LSP and target setting of LAA.</p> <p>Keen to influence strategic vision of the county and a seat at the table for such discussions.</p> <p>Recognition of an enhanced role for councils with Quality Status.</p> <p>Should be prescribed timescales for responses.</p> <p>Should be more of a commitment to consult on all matters appertaining to the work of the Council.</p> <p>The Council's website is difficult to navigate and should be more user friendly.</p> <p>Reference should be made to the re-charge arrangements for election costs.</p> <p>Can the Council confirm that if they enter in to an agreement with a local council to provide corporate support services Council officers would be indemnified against providing inappropriate advice.</p> <p>Will the Council make information about grant schemes readily available to local councils?</p> <p>It would be impractical for us (STC) to provide an opportunity for all Shrewsbury Shropshire Cllrs space on our meeting agendas (currently the majority are twin hatted).</p>	<p>Covered at section 2 and 4</p> <p>Covered at section 2 and 4</p> <p>Revisions made</p> <p>Included in Council's service standards</p> <p>Covered at section 2</p> <p>We seek continual improvements.</p> <p>Revision included</p> <p>If advice is provided through written agreement then Council officers would be indemnified.</p> <p>Revised to include at section 11</p> <p>Noted</p>

	<p>Whilst we are happy to raise issues with you that are pertinent to service delivery we can not be your eyes and ears and could not be deemed liable if we had not raised an issue.</p> <p>We are not aware of the role of Tree Wardens or Snow Wardens and should there not be Flood Wardens?</p> <p>There should not be an expectation that we should inform Shropshire Council of our future plans and projects, after all we are independent statutory authorities in our own right.</p> <p>We would expect consultation on issues around emergency planning and community resilience.</p> <p>Thought should be given to devolving gritting, provision of sandbags and street naming providing necessary indemnities against claims could be established.</p>	<p>Revised to include Severe Weather Wardens</p> <p>The Charter proposes a two way relationship</p> <p>Revised</p> <p>Not anticipated as these are statutory duties although assistance on the ground would we welcomed</p>
Cllr Relph Church Stretton TC personal comments	LJCs must not undermine the direct relationship between Shropshire Councils and town and parish councils.	There is no intention to do so.
Cllr Beechey Albrighton Parish Council personal comments	<p>Drafting suggestions proposed.</p> <p>Should add a commitment to respond promptly to telephone messages.</p> <p>A commitment should be made to consult on “any plans and strategies that impact on local communities”.</p>	<p>Included in Council’s Service Standards</p> <p>See section 4</p>
Oswestry Town Council	<p>Seek clarification on how the Charter will be implemented for councils not in SALC membership.</p> <p>Larger town councils should be involved in the strategic vision setting for the county and their towns. How will town councils be given a seat at the table for such important discussions?</p> <p>A timeframe should be confirmed for detailed responses rather than just an acknowledgement.</p> <p>Disappointment that larger councils are not recognised within the Charter.</p> <p>Clarification on how local councils will participate in countywide partnerships and how input and feedback will be ensured.</p>	<p>SALC membership is not relevant the Charter is between councils.</p> <p>See section 4</p> <p>Included in Council’s Service Standards</p> <p>All councils are recognised</p> <p>The Charter is a framework rather than detail on “how”</p>

	<p>The elections section should detail the financial and resource support that will be provided and confirmation that the published lists will be available in, or adjacent to, the contested area.</p> <p>SALC and Shropshire Council should maintain and distribute a list of up to date Members and senior Officers, duties and contact details.</p> <p>Will indemnity be offered to local councils that take up the offer of advice from Shropshire Council?</p> <p>Why should local councils inform Shropshire Council of their future plans and projects as this does not appear to be reciprocated?</p>	<p>Revised. Local councils responsible for posting notices.</p> <p>Already provided on a regular basis</p> <p>See above</p> <p>The Charter proposes a two way relationship.</p>
Bayston Hill PC	Bayston Hill PC confirm they are willing to sign up to the Charter once it is finalised.	
Kemberton PC	<p>Kemberton PC confirm they are able to sign up to the Charter and have no comments to make on its contents.</p> <p>They note that given the size of their community not all areas of the Charter will be relevant or appropriate to them.</p>	
Albrighton PC	<p>Broadly welcomes the Charter.</p> <p>The Charter would benefit from the inclusion of KPIs that define standards.</p> <p>Drafting suggestions proposed. Look forward to seeing a new Charter emerge which will provide clarity regarding the relationships between the various councils in Shropshire.</p>	
Astley PC	The opinion of the Council is that a Charter is totally unnecessary. The interaction between the PC, Shropshire Council and the previous Borough Council has always been good and therefore a Charter would serve no useful purpose whatsoever. The PC are unwilling to sign up to any such Charter at the present time.	
Welshampton and Lyneal PC	Confirms its support to the principles of the Charter and thank the Council for producing a clearly worded and structured document. The PC has reviewed many documents from Shropshire Council and its partners and it was one of the easiest to read.	
Cound PC	The Charter is quite unnecessary and they are not in favour of adopting it.	

Ludlow TC	<p>Supportive of a Charter but feel success will rest with a clear understanding and acknowledgement of the differences between large and small councils. The Charter assumes both parties are equal which does not reflect reality. Would like to see a clear obligation for Shropshire Council to offer an explanation to smaller councils, especially where they disagree with the comments of a TPC.</p> <p>Shropshire Council should be mindful that TPCs with less resources and staff available to them can easily become overwhelmed by large amounts of information to disseminate and digest within short deadlines.</p> <p>Town Councillors do not always receive timely information meaning they are unable to answer queries from residents making them look ineffective in their role.</p> <p>Ludlow TC would like to see actual checks and balances to ensure Shropshire Council is diligent in its responsibilities to smaller local authorities who have a responsibility to represent local concerns within the wider authority framework.</p>	<p>Revisions made</p> <p>See para 2.8</p> <p>Seeking to improve communications</p> <p>Implicit in the principles of the Charter</p>
Ellesmere TC	<p>There should be monthly meetings with SALC. Previous Charter was not acted upon and departmental officers didn't know how to use the Charter. Should use more decisive wording "will do" rather than "seek to".</p> <p>LJCs should be more democratically balanced.</p> <p>Should be a clear list of what is being discussed at Cabinet and Committees in advance so that TPCs can be fully aware of Shropshire Councils discussions.</p> <p>Further suggestions for devolutions: allotments; TPOs; Toilets; Noise and Nuisance Abatement; Street naming; Street lighting; Parking restrictions; Off street car parking; Issue of bus/rail passes; Licenses for taxis; Street trading and public entertainment; some aspects of libraries and museums.</p>	<p>Two formal Liaison Meetings per year and monthly Management Meetings. Charter to be included in induction training.</p> <p>All Council papers appear on the website.</p> <p>Noted</p>
Selattyn and Gobowen PC	<p>Happy with the overall document.</p> <p>Shropshire Council needs a consistent approach to advertising the LJCs and clerks need publicity for LJCs in good time.</p>	<p>Noted to be considered in LJC evaluation.</p>

	<p>A timescale for responses to TPCs should be included.</p> <p>Should encourage the clustering of local councils eg town and parish meetings that used to occur in the old OBC were very useful.</p>	<p>Included in Council's Service Standards</p> <p>Does the SALC Area Committee fulfil this role?</p>
<p>Cllr Derek Armstrong Broseley TC personal comments</p>	<p>No mention of the need for councillors and council staff to exercise financial prudence and frugality. Should include a new aim "To exercise financial prudence and frugality when carrying out the functions of local government in Shropshire and to strive constantly to minimise the cost to Council Tax payers".</p> <p>Similar commitments should also be included for TPCs.</p> <p>Information should always be available on the website as of right so should never have to be requested except by someone who does not have internet facilities.</p>	<p>Implicit duty as a Local Authority</p> <p>The website is a key communication channel</p>
<p>Withington PC</p>	<p>Concern that the importance placed on becoming a Quality Parish no longer appears to apply. We hope the importance of Quality Status can be reinstated. It could for instance be part of the criteria for delegating services to parishes.</p>	<p>Revisions made</p>
<p>Kinnerley PC</p>	<p>The draft Charter is in an acceptable form and Kinnerley PC would be agreeable to signing up to such a document once the consultation has been finished.</p>	
<p>Cockshutt cum Petton PC</p>	<p>No specific comment to make on contents but pleasing to see it is based on common sense.</p>	
<p>Leebotwood and Longnor PC</p>	<p>The document does not flow. The document refers to supporting documents that are not readily available. These should be adequately signposted within the document.</p> <p>Should include the requirement to use a uniform form of electronic document file format, some documents received can not be readily opened by parish councillors.</p> <p>In what timeframe will SC respond to written correspondence?</p>	<p>Revisions made with clear links</p> <p>PDF is the standard file format</p> <p>Included in Council's Service Standards</p>

	<p>Communication via SALC is confusing; should all correspondence from TPCs to SC be copied to SALC and vice versa. A policy decision is needed on this. Should SALC cascade information to parishes or should this go via the LJs? Effective use of parish councillors' time, which is given voluntarily, should be recognised by Shropshire Council. Effective communication is very important.</p>	<p>Referred to SALC SALC cascade on behalf of the Council.</p>
SALC Policy Group	<p>The document is too long. It needs to be more succinct. A summary is needed. SALC acronym needs to be amended to ALC. Greater acknowledgement should be given to Quality Councils Parishes need to recognise that this is a two way document and they have to take responsibility for things too Could a list of key decisions made by the Council be sent to parishes on a regular basis by email? Shropshire Councillors should be encouraged to regularly attend parish council meetings. All Council Officers need to be aware of the Charter and its commitments.</p>	<p>Executive Summary produced. Revised Revised</p> <p>Consideration is being given to this See section 3</p> <p>Noted and awareness programme planned</p>
Rushbury PC	<p>The Charter implies that the PC will comment on planning matters and assist SC in monitoring planning compliance – at present the PC is not being provided with this information so it would not be able to help in this regard.</p>	<p>It is Shropshire Council policy to host all Development Management decisions on the website.</p>
Church Stretton TC	<p>The Charter is welcome but specificity is needed on certain aspects if it is to be meaningfully translated into practice. LJs should not undermine the direct relationship between SC and the TPCs. Additional aim proposed: To deal fairly and equally with all local councils while recognising and respecting their diversity. Timescale required for responses from Shropshire Council. Some correspondence has waited for over two months and this is not unusual. In relation to a local council objecting to a planning application it is not adequate for SC merely to refer to the reasoning in the planning officer's</p>	<p>No intention to do so. Revised Included in Council's Service Standards The Officer reports are the logical place to include consideration in cases</p>

	<p>report. The TPC should be entitled to a written explanation of the Committees reasoning for disregarding their objections – only then will we have better informed planning decisions at both levels.</p> <p>LJCs should not be the primary communication route between SC and local councils.</p> <p>If LJCs are to be effective they need to be re-designed applying the hub and cluster model and combined with re-designed Local Area Partnerships to promote joint working across all sectors.</p> <p>There should be significantly more reference to how both tiers will engage, both separately and jointly, with the third and private sectors.</p> <p>Unitary councillors should attend TPC meetings and not rely only on LJCs.</p> <p>Shropshire Council should send out a quarterly digest of the decisions it has taken affecting local councils so there is a consistency of communication.</p> <p>SALC does not communicate the substance of its dialogues with Shropshire Council to its constituent members.</p> <p>It is a confusion of roles to expect SALC to be a communication arm of SC.</p> <p>We recommend SC should send its communications electronically and simultaneously to Clerks and Chairpersons of local councils.</p> <p>Principal market towns should expect their unitary councillors to attend every meeting whilst parish councils should expect attendance only once or twice per year with written reports on other occasions.</p> <p>It is essential that senior representatives of both SC and larger town councils should meet quarterly to progress their shared strategic agenda.</p> <p>The Charter should recognise that TPCs have agendas of very different order and communication should be adjusted accordingly.</p> <p>Flood Wardens should also be included and it should be mandatory for utility organisations to attend the Flood Forums.</p> <p>Further drafting proposals made.</p>	<p>where an officer view differs from that of a TPC.</p> <p>No intention for this to be the case.</p> <p>LJC Evaluation underway</p> <p>This Charter is between the councils of Shropshire.</p> <p>Engagement strategies exist with other sectors.</p> <p>See section 3</p> <p>Consideration is being given to this.</p> <p>Referred to SALC</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>This is the role of the Larger Local Councils Forum</p> <p>Revised</p>
St Martins PC	<p>Timescale needed for responses – suggest within seven days.</p> <p>Clerks should have direct access to officers and not have to use the CSC</p> <p>Tree Wardens and Snow Wardens – should acknowledge that this is not</p>	<p>Included within Council's Service Standards. Contact lists of key officers are</p>

	<p>always possible Information on LJs needs to reach parish councils in good time which doesn't currently happen.</p>	<p>provided to clerks. Noted</p>
Much Wenlock TC	<p>Could not sign up to the Charter as it currently stands as it does not recognise or reflect the relative resources available to SC and TPCs – it is deemed unbalanced in terms of responsibilities and obligations – a personalised charter would be more useful.</p>	<p>The Charter seeks to identify principles and a framework for working together.</p>
Longden PC	<p>An additional aim to enable TPCs to take part by co-option or election to scrutiny committees of Shropshire Council. Responses to communications should be within an agreed timescale. Further information needed on how SC will deal with non-statutory consultations. Timescale needed on posting decisions and meeting papers on the website. Clerks should be provided with an internal Shropshire Council telephone directory. An appendix to explain the formal complaints procedure is needed. Further detail needed on what is free advice and what needs to be charged for. Would like more publicity on grants available, particularly when budgets are being set.</p>	<p>No plans to do this  Included within Council's Service Standards  Not possible - electronic only on secure intranet site. Will include link Case by case discussions  Noted</p>
Bridgnorth TC	<p>The document meets BTC requirements but there are reservations over the funding arrangements and the lack of encouragement for Quality Parish Councils. There should be an enhanced scheme of funding support for quality councils.</p>	<p>Revised  Not supported</p>
Kinlet PC	<p>The document does not carry out the intent of using concise and plain language.</p>	<p>Executive Summary produced</p>
Stottesdon and Sidbury PC	<p>Should allow for adequate time to respond. The document is repetitive and could be reduced by making points once. To simplify the document headings could be used once listing the responsibilities of both parties. The appendices repeat what is in the main document.</p>	<p>Incorporated in Executive Summary  Revised</p>



Broseley TC	Strongly support the network of LJC's and Broseley and Barrow LJC is working well for these communities	
Hopesay PC	<p>Yet to be convinced that such a Charter is really needed or that adopting it would benefit us.</p> <p>A shorter document would be preferable with greater precision in wording. Our recent experience of consultation has been poor and our engagement has been a waste of our limited resources.</p> <p>Whilst we recognise the advantages of electronic dealings the costs of equipping our councillors is prohibitive and it is unreasonable for SC to seek to offload time and printing costs to parish clerks.</p> <p>Drafting proposals included.</p>	Executive Summary produced
Minsterley PC	Minsterley PC has agreed to sign up to the Charter.	
Ellesmere Rural PC	<p>The Charter should be provided to all employees of Shropshire Council to make them aware of their responsibility with TPCs as the first tier of councils. Nominate local Emergency Planning Officers to work with SC.</p> <p>Delegated services should include all those suggested by NALC (list enclosed with response).</p>	Noted
All Stretton, Smethcote and Woolstaston PC	Agree the document has laudable aims. Concerned there are no timescales published for activity and no evidence of how the charter will be turned in to reality by delivering services within an acceptable timescale.	
Wem TC	<p>Welcome the Charter to strengthen the relationship between TPCs and SC. Need to ensure all staff and members have a clear understanding of the role of local councils.</p> <p>The roles and responsibilities of parish councils are not always understood.</p>	
Ruyton XI Towns PC	<p>Overall support what the Charter is trying to achieve.</p> <p>A uniform file format in communication was important and should be included in the clerks report as it has caused confusion on a number of occasions.</p>	PDF is the uniform file format
Bishop's Castle TC	Support the draft Shropshire Charter.	
Cleobury and Rural LJC	<p>Suggest adding car parking and Lengthsman scheme to possible delegations.</p> <p>Clarification needed on the provision of funding re election costs for TPCs.</p>	A formula basis is agreed

Pontesbury PC	<p>Provision needs to be made to distribute information to non members of SALC Individual telephone numbers would save the clerk/councillors having to go through CSC</p>	<p>SALC distribute to all LCs irrespective of membership Key Officer contact list provided</p>
Grinshill PC	<p>Shropshire Council is not working to the Charter and so we are not prepared to sign. Failure to meet commitments in section 3 No clarity on monitoring of standards Is the Charter nothing more than what should be expected? With regard to planning the clerk should be notified of the decision with a resume of PC comments given the time the parish council gives to making informed comments</p> <p>No respect has been shown to the parish with the sudden withdrawal of a bus service to Grinshill with no consultation.</p>	<p>The officer report includes reasoning for decisions taken contrary to TPC views and the web site is where all decisions are hosted. We are also developing an e mail alert system for Parish Councils to be notified when decisions are taken. Accepted timescales not ideal and more effort now being made to give time for discussion.</p>
Weston Under Redcastle PC	<p>Shropshire Council is not working to the Charter and we are not prepared to sign. Who will report on monitoring of standards within Shropshire Council and the parish councils? Is the Charter nothing more than what should be expected? With regard to planning the clerk should be notified of the decision with a resume of PC comments given the time the parish council gives to making informed comments No respect has been shown to the parish with the sudden withdrawal of a bus service to Weston under Redcastle with no consultation. What difference would a Quality Parish Council make if the Parish Plan is properly adopted?</p>	<p>As above</p> <p>As above A Parish Plan is different to a local council achieving Quality Council Status.</p>