



<u>Committee and Date</u>
COUNCIL
26 September 2013

<u>Item</u>
3
Public

MINUTES

OF

MEETING OF SHROPSHIRE COUNCIL

HELD ON 18 JULY 2013
AT 10.00 AM

PRESENT:

Mr P Adams
Mr A Bannerman
Mr N J Bardsley
Mr T Barker
Mrs C A Barnes
Mrs J B Barrow
Mr K R Barrow
Mr M Bennett
Mr T H Biggins
Mr V Bushell JP
Mr J S Cadwallader
Mrs K D Calder
Mr D S Carroll
Mr L Chapman
Mr S F Charmley
Mrs A M Chebsey
Mr P A Cherrington
Mr J E Clarke
Mr G L Dakin
Mr S Davenport
Mr A B Davies
Mrs P A Dee
Mr D W Evans

Mr R A Evans
Mr E J Everall
Mr N J Hartin
Mrs E A Hartley
Mr J Hurst-Knight
Dr J E Jones
Mr S P A Jones
Mr J M W Kenny
Mr C J Lea
Mr D G Lloyd MBE
Mr R J Macey
Ms J Mackenzie
Mrs P Moseley
Mr A N Mosley
Mrs C M A Motley
Mr P A Nutting
Mr K J Pardy
Mr W M Parr
Mrs V Parry
Mr M G Pate
Mr M T Price
Mr D W L Roberts
Mrs D M Shingleton

Mr J Tandy
Mrs R Taylor-Smith
Mr R Tindall
Mr D Tremellen
Mr K Turley
Mr D R Turner
Mr A E Walpole
Mr S J West
Mrs C Wild
Mr B B Williams RD
Mr J M Williams
Mr L Winwood
Mrs T Woodward
Mr P A D Wynn

14. APOLOGIES

The Chief Executive reported apologies for absence had been received from Mr J T Bebb, Mr G H L Butler, Mrs H Fraser, Mr R Huffer, Mrs T Huffer, Mr R Hughes, Mr V J Hunt, Mrs H M Kidd , Mr C J Mellings, Mr D J Minnery, Mrs M Mullock, Mr M J Owen, Mr K Roberts and Mr M L Wood.

15. DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

Members were reminded that they must not participate in the discussion or voting on any matter in which they had a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest and should leave the room prior to the commencement of the debate.

16. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 16th May 2013, as circulated with the agenda papers, be approved and signed as a correct record.

17. ANNOUNCEMENTS

17.1 **Chairman's Engagements**

The Chairman referred members to the list of official engagements carried out by himself and the Speaker and Vice-Chairman since the last meeting of the Council on 16th May 2013 which had been circulated at the meeting.

17.2 **Queen's Birthday Honours**

The Chairman announced that the following Shropshire residents had been awarded honours in the Queen's Birthday Honours List and that he had written to each one of the recipients to congratulate them on their achievement:

Members of the Order of the British Empire (MBE)

Dr Joan Lesley Daniels

Senior Reserve Manager, Fenn's, Whixall and Bettisfield Mosses National Nature Reserve, Natural England.
For services to Nature Conservation.

Dr Jeremy Richard Johnson

Lately Medical Director, Severn Hospice, Shropshire.
For services to Palliative Medicine.

Mrs Helen Lesley Purchase

For services to the NSPCC, the Royal National Lifeboat Institution and to the community in Albrighton and Donington, Shropshire.

Medallist of the Order of the British Empire (BEM)

Mrs Shirley Ann Brookes

For services to charitable giving in Telford, Shropshire.

Mark Anthony Hall

Grounds Manager, Harper Adams University.

For services to Land-Based Higher Education and to the National Vegetable Society.

18. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

18.1 Petitions

The Speaker advised that a petition bearing more than 1,000 signatures to stop Shropshire Council, closing, scaling down or transferring to a third party Ludlow tip/recycling centre based in Ludlow Business Park off Coder Road, has been received from Amanda Pope of Ludlow requesting a debate. Under the Council's Petitions Scheme, Amanda Pope would be given up to 5 minutes to open the debate by outlining her case, after which members would have 15 minutes to debate the matter.

The Speaker invited Amanda Perry to open the debate. She thanked the Council for having the petition scheme, enabling local people to have a say in what services they would like the Council to provide and indicated that after only 2 weeks the petition had over 1,300 signatures and many more people had wanted to sign well after the petition had been handed in.

Amanda Perry stressed that the petitioners urged the Council to keep the Ludlow Tip open in its current form and not close, scale down or transfer it. She emphasised that the skip was well used and a vital amenity to the community in both Ludlow and the surrounding area, giving local residents a place to take recycling and also non recycling rubbish as the waste collection could not or would not take all of their waste. She continued to state that people could not always travel great distances and therefore really relied on this local facility. If the facility was closed, local people would struggle to dispose of their rubbish which could have a detrimental impact on the environment. She drew attention to the fact that the Ludlow tip was not open in the mornings and this had already caused some fly tipping, so if it was closed completely then fly tipping would be an even greater problem, with the costs of having to clear waste from the side of roads and verges resulting in much greater costs for the Council and the local community in the long run.

She expressed the view that the local economy would suffer as South Shropshire relied on tourism and rubbish being dumped might well put people off wanting to visit the area at all. Transferring the facility would not guarantee its future and it could end up being poorly run and maintained and even closed if the new owners ran out of funding or could not make it pay. In conclusion, she expressed concern that without the Ludlow Tip taking in waste there would be more side waste and more fly tipping, and not only would the environment suffer but the local residents would lose faith and pride in Shropshire, as it may well become Dropshire with fly tips and excess litter everywhere you look.

Mrs R. Taylor-Smith thanked Amanda Pope for highlighting a valuable local service serving a wide area that was held in high regard by the local community. She stressed the importance of the service continuing but accepted that this might have to be through another organisation.

Mrs V. Parry expressed concern that closure of the facility would result in an increase in fly tipping and greater costs for the Council and considered that the facility should be kept open as a Council run operation.

Mr R. Evans requested that the petition be referred to the appropriate Overview and Scrutiny Committee for consideration.

Mr S. Charmley indicated that a Cabinet report on the Coder Road facility was being prepared and was due to come forward for consideration in September. He thanked the petitioners for their input and considered that, as Cabinet would be considering the position in the near future, no action should be taken at the present time.

It was proposed by Mr S. Charmley and seconded by Mr J. Hurst-Knight, that no action be taken on the petition.

15 members requested a recorded vote on the proposition, the outcome of which was as follows:

For the proposition: (40)

Mr P Adams, Mr N J Bardsley, Mr T Barker, Mrs J B Barrow, Mr K R Barrow, Mr M Bennett, Mr T H Biggins, Mr J S Cadwallader, Mrs K D Calder, Mr D S Carroll, Mr L Chapman, Mr S F Charmley, Mr P A Cherrington, Mr G L Dakin, Mr S Davenport, Mr A B Davies, Mr D W Evans, Mr E J Everall, Mrs E A Hartley, Mr J Hurst-Knight, Mr S P A Jones, Mr C J Lea, Mr D G Lloyd, Mr R J Macey, Mrs C M A Motley, Mr P Nutting, Mr W M Parr, Mr M G Pate, Mr M Price, Mr D Roberts, Mr R Tindall, Mr K Turley, Mr D R Turner, Mr A E Walpole, Mr S J West, Mrs C Wild, Mr B B Williams, Mr L Winwood, Mrs T Woodward and Mr P A D Wynn.

Against the proposition: (19)

Mr A Bannerman, Mrs C A Barnes, Mr V Bushell, Mrs A M Chebsey, Mr J E Clarke, Mrs P A Dee, Mr R A Evans, Mr N J Hartin, Dr J E Jones, Mr J M W Kenny, Ms J Mackenzie, Mrs P Moseley, Mr A N Mosley, Mr K J Pardy, Mrs V Parry, Mrs D M Shineton, Mr J Tandy, Mr D Tremellen and Mr J M Williams.

Abstentions: (1)

Mrs R Taylor-Smith.

The proposition was carried with 40 Members voting in favour and 19 Members voting against, with 1 abstention.

18.2 Public Questions

The Speaker indicated there were no public questions.

19. **QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS**

The Speaker advised that the following questions had been received in accordance with Procedure Rule 15:

(a) Received from Mr D Roberts:

“Last year your predecessor promised me, via a question at council, that a complete review of primary school catchment areas would take place after the election, please can you tell me when that will start and how long it will take?”

Mrs A Hartley replied:

“Thank you for raising this issue. The response made by Cecilia Motley on 3rd May 2012 stated that “the Council will consider undertaking a full review of the catchment areas for schools”. Having considered this in detail, we have concluded that a wholesale review is not required at this time. It is apparent, however, that there are a small number of areas where it would be helpful to undertake some review. I can confirm that the area you identified will be part of this review. This will commence in 2013 with a view to recommendations going to the Local Admissions Forum for wider consultation, for possible implementation in September 2015. This is the earliest time that changes of this nature can be implemented.”

(b) Received from Mr D Roberts:

“Whilst I am delighted that a number of roads in my Division have been treated with tar and grit, would it have been sensible to have filled the holes in first?”

Mrs C Wild replied:

“The roads in question have been checked and I can respond as follows:

Vron Gate.

This has been surfaced dressed this season. Since the work was done a local farmer has been doing some harvesting and he has, quite properly, been cleaning mud off the road afterwards. Unfortunately this has caused some damage to the newly dressed surface. Arrangements will be made for the Roadmaster to go to this site and undertake the necessary repairs.

Stanford Lane.

Three small holes can be seen through the surface dressing. These are most likely to be small potholes that have developed between the pre surface dressing patching that took place and the dressing. The dressing team do not carry tarmac to undertake repairs. This is the way the process has operated for years. Technicians do inspect the sites two or three days before the treatment and ensure any repairs are done, however, they might miss the odd minor defect.

Station Road.

There is a small edge break that has been identified. As for the potholes above this probably happened between the pre dressing preparation and the surfacing. This should also have been picked up by technicians checking dressing sites a few days prior to the treatment.

Vicarage Lane.

This was partially completed. There has been deterioration over the winter that means a section will need a treatment more structural than surface dressing. That will be put forward into our next programme.”

By way of a supplementary question, Mr D Roberts commented on the need to ensure that potholes were completely re-filled before surface dressing works.

In reply, Mrs Wild indicated that she would take the comments on board and refer to the issue in her Portfolio Holder report later in the meeting.

(c) Received from Mrs A Chebsey:

“It has been some time now since the street lighting in my division was adjusted to go off at 12 midnight and on again at 5am within the residential areas. Many residents are happy with the policy but quite a number have raised the matter with me. My area is adjacent to the town centre in Shrewsbury and many residents work late into the night. They have raised concerns about walking on secluded pathways and steps where the lighting is now off. To ascertain if there are any problems arising from this policy is it possible to review the situation before the winter and the darker mornings? I’m sure all members would be interested to know to what extent this policy has reduced the carbon footprint and also what money has been saved but also it would be of interest to know if crime and anti-social behaviour has increased and if any accidents (such as slips and falls) have occurred due to the lack of lighting. As I stated earlier many residents are supportive of the policy but in the interests of those who are out and about during the night it seems appropriate to review and possibly amend the policy slightly before the winter period.”

Mrs C Wild replied:

“During the financial year 2012/13 some 4,600 street lights were converted to operate in a part-night lighting regime, as follows:-

Shrewsbury Urban (North)	1538
Shrewsbury Urban (West)	1389
Shrewsbury Rural	450
South West Shropshire	1181
Total	4558

These lights were converted over a period of some 9 months, with the majority having been converted in the first quarter of 2013, therefore a full 12 months savings have not as yet been reflected in accounts. However, during a full 12 months of operation, financial savings in the region of £57k will be achieved on direct energy costs and a further saving of £5.2k in respect of the Climate Change Levy.

The Council is committed to reviewing the application of part-night lighting across the County and is in liaison with the Bronze Level Tasking Group (BLTG), a multi discipline body whose remit is to identify trends in crime and anti-social behaviour and put into place strategies to minimise such trends, and who meet on a monthly basis. Feedback from the BLTG has not shown any rises in trends for crime or anti-social behaviour in the areas which have been converted to date.

As part of our risk assessment process, to determine which street lights could not be converted to part-night lighting, we examine obstructions within the highway, however there may be instances of steps being present which we are still unaware of, if Councillor Mrs. Chebsey can

appraise me of such instances I will be more than happy to check such instances out on her behalf. That said, the Authority has not received any notices of trips or falls where part-night lighting has been cited as attributing to such a trip or fall to date.

There have been some 90 complaints, or comments, received about the deployment of part-night lighting since April 2012, of which only 2 originated in the Porthill Division.

As a result of having received all of the report from across the County we have responded positively by reinstating lighting in the vicinity of two sheltered housing schemes, which had not been brought to our notice by the relevant Housing Associations and in one instance we converted one light back to all night operation for a vulnerable young man who was being harassed by neighbours and was known to the BLTG.”

By way of a supplementary question, Mrs Chebsey enquired who would be responsible if a problem occurred with utility works due to a lack of street lighting.

In reply, Mrs Wild stated that she understood that the Utilities Companies would be responsible but undertook to check on the position.

(d) Received from Mr M Kenny:

“The kerbside collection of plastics seems to have been generally welcomed and I am sure figures can be given for volumes or tonnages collected without asking, but there are many different plastics, how do they sort out which plastic goes to which processor and what happens to the plastic collected from the kerbside they do not send for processing?”

Mr S Charmley replied:

“The mixed plastic (bottles, pots, tubs and trays) and cans collected from the kerbside recycling service are separated at Veolia’s Four Ashes Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) in Staffordshire. The separated mixed plastic is bailed and sent on for further separation into the respective grades of plastic such as low density polyethylene (LDPE), high density polyethylene (HDPE), polypropylene (PP) etc., at a specialist facility operated by Veolia located at Rainham, Essex, which receives mixed plastic from around the UK. After separation and grading the materials are then sold on the open market, to a wide variety of reprocessors/manufacturers who use the material as a replacement for manufacturing using virgin material.

Materials not suitable for reprocessing include plastic bags, black containers (due to optical sorting not being able to distinguish between the black conveyor and the material) and plant pots. These are removed during MRF process at Four Ashes and sent with other rejected material to Veolia's Energy Recovery Facility (ERF) at Tyseley, Birmingham. The rejected plastics from this process represent less than 1% of the total plastic collected at the kerbside."

By way of a supplementary question, Mr Kenny enquired why the recyclable materials could not be sorted at source/on collection.

In reply, Mr Charmley stated that this was dictated by finances and how this could be achieved in the future was being examined.

(e) Received from Mr M Kenny:

"Has the percentage of money spent on cycle ways maintenance kept pace with the rest of the highways maintenance budget vis a vis the increase in cycle usage over the past two years?"

Mrs C Wild replied:

"The highways maintenance budgets are split for principal and non-principal roads and by division, but not by highway type. They are not therefore, broken down for carriageway, footway or cycleway. All highway types are subject to routine inspections and defects logged and repairs ordered on a priority basis, depending on the defects found. Whilst there are budget pressures on highway maintenance they are shared across all road types, the money going to those defects where there is the greatest risk of harm or injury to the user. The increase in cycle ways over recent years has not brought with it any additional dedicated maintenance money that money coming from the general highway maintenance pot."

By way of a supplementary question, Mr Kenny asked what action was being taken to cut back the evasive vegetation on the A5 from Montford Bridge to Felton Butler.

In reply, Mrs Wild stated that this was the responsibility of the Highways Agency who were attending to the work required.

(f) Received from Mr D Tremellen:

"SAFETY SETBACK DISTANCES & BUFFER ZONES FOR WIND TURBINE SCHEMES.

The draft SAMDev has accepted a very restricted version of the British Horse Society's (BHS) guidelines for setback distances from bridleways, but makes no reference to buffer zones to protect residential properties in the area neighbouring any turbine development.

1) Could SAMDev be modified to include the full recommendation of the clearly defined BHS setback distances of 3 x height-to-tip for a minor Public Right of Way and 4 x height-to-tip for National Trails and Ride UK routes (e.g. The Jack Mytton Way)?

2) Following the introduction of buffer zones in the Local Plans of other county authorities, would the Member assure the people of Shropshire that SAMDev will establish buffer zones of 2km (1.25 miles) distance to separate residential properties from the impact of such industrial development?"

Mr M Price replied:

1) *Could SAMDev be modified to include the full recommendation of the clearly defined BHS setback distances of 3 x height-to-tip for a minor Public Right of Way and 4 x height-to-tip for National Trails and Ride UK routes (e.g. The Jack Mytton Way)?*

"The SAMDev draft Development Management policies were consulted on in early 2013 and a further report will be produced to consider these as part of the SAMDev final plan at the end of the year.

Draft Policy MD8 provides guidance about new infrastructure provision and for wind energy proposals it identifies a number of specific considerations which give rise to local concern. If the policy is adopted applicants for such proposals would be required to provide sufficient information to allow a qualitative assessment of the potential impacts against relevant national, local or good practice standards including:

- i. British Horse Society standards (2010) for the buffer distance between wind turbines and bridleways;
- ii. ETSU R 97 standards for noise assessment;
- iii. The policies of the AONB Management Plan."

2) *Following the introduction of buffer zones in the Local Plans of other county authorities, would the Member assure the people of Shropshire that SAMDev will establish buffer zones of 2km (1.25 miles) distance to separate residential properties from the impact of such industrial development?*

"The development of the draft SAMDev policies has been informed by advice from recent consultation responses, including detailed discussion with local campaign groups. Shropshire Council does not believe that the interests of Shropshire would be best served by imposing minimum separation distances or buffer zones in a policy document designed to last at least 10 years. Turbine technology is already changing more rapidly than existing national guidance and any such policy would rapidly become outdated, undermining its value in decision making.

A buffer zone provides no acknowledgement of local topography, landscape quality or other factors such as geology, flood risk areas or the views of the community. Different renewable energy technologies generate different impacts, depending on the technology concerned and the nature and scale of the facilities within the local context in which they are proposed. Noise impacts can still occur outside a defined separation distance and adopting such an approach could therefore actually prevent all the relevant noise impacts from being taken into account in the context of a specific proposal. Instead, Shropshire Council proposes to apply a criteria-based approach which allows all relevant impacts, including noise, to be assessed in the light of local circumstances.

The preferred policy approach identified in SAMDev draft policy MD8 is therefore criteria based and places appropriate emphasis on protecting our natural and historic environment assets and their setting (whether designated or not) and their significance to the local visitor economy. It would allow decision makers to better weigh the local significance of these issues against national support in principle for renewable energy development. Community involvement should be considered as an integral part of the development process and should be engaged, by the developer, throughout the development process and from an early stage.”

By way of a supplementary question, Mr Tremellen asked for a list of the local campaign groups that had been consulted.

In reply, Mr Price undertook to provide Mr Tremellen with the details requested.

(g) Received from Mr J M Williams:

“Shropshire Council plans to build 3,640 new homes in the town by 2026. This includes the Shrewsbury South and West Urban Extensions and other significant sites.

Shrewsbury and Shropshire offers an exceptionally high quality environment which is very attractive to major national house building companies. Is it therefore acceptable that developers, quoting market conditions, are seeking planning approvals for houses which only meet the minimum standard of build i.e. Sustainability Level Code 3.

An agent in a recent planning application in one of Shrewsbury’s Conservation Areas stated “Due to current market conditions, land value constraints and a lack of clarity around grant incentives a slightly lower standard of build in terms of sustainability has had to be adopted here. Whilst the applicant would...have liked to introduced more sustainable measures over and above current building regulations, uncertainties around being able to recover costs in a price sensitive

market have meant erring on the side of caution.” Is Shropshire Council prepared to accept such minimum standards?

On the contrary, in view of Shropshire and Shrewsbury’s exceptionally high quality environment and the high target of house building in the County, Shropshire Council should set down a set of planning and design standards and require developers to demonstrate their willingness to act upon these essential points including:

- i. That all houses should be built to a minimum of Sustainability Code Level 4, with preference given to tenders offering Level’s 5 and 6.*
- ii. That there should be no dilution of sustainability standards for social housing, which is the primary need for housing in Shrewsbury.*
- iii. Plan to build to the best aspect, so as to use orientation for maximum solar gain and that photovoltaic’s be included as standard.*
- iv. That building materials be sourced from local suppliers, not from the developer’s own supply chain. Council must insist on this.*
- v. Internally there should be flexibility of room plans i.e. that the design should allow for retro modification to allow for changing family needs over time. This can be achieved by introducing lightweight, fully sound-insulated panels, instead of developer’s preference for the use of concrete block walls. The problem seems to be that many house plans specify load bearing walls when it would be desirable NOT to use such walls except where absolutely essential. There seems to be a mind-set regarding block walls, either aggregate or lightweight as the norm, which needs to be challenged.*
- vi. Roof space – allow for loft extensions as useable hobby rooms, extension of living space etc. Don’t allow roof joists/rafters to be introduced which are not load-bearing and also specify roof support members which do not render the loft space inaccessible.*
- vii. There should be careful planning of outlook and amenity i.e. build in and around existing features of the physical landscape and preserve trees, so as to ensure MINIMUM impact upon the natural environment. Working with knowledgeable organisations is of paramount importance to this end.*
- viii. Be fully aware of the local flora and fauna and ensure it is integrated into the new development.*
- ix. Ensure that sustainable systems of transport, cycle-ways, pedestrian-ways are given highest priority.*
- x. Car parking must be planned so as not allow parking on the footways as per Sutton Bridge Junction. In Besford House the parking could have been to the rear of the houses, as implied by the Conservation Officer! This results from squeezing in extra houses at the expense of amenity and circulation space,*
- xi. Make estates less linear; introduce staggered building lines. The sculptural impact of the new build would generally be more pleasing without the usual boring uniformity.*
- xii. Again, with regard to the new build - look to variations of textures and colour as opposed to bland uniformity.*

xiii. To achieve much of the above, it may mean utilising a more 'modern' approach to new build than is currently the case.

The above criteria are not in any way onerous, many are good practice Building Control and Council has the powers to choose developers who demonstrate their willingness to work with us to achieve the most sustainable outcomes for our housing stock. Is the Council prepared to ensure that developers meet our sustainability standards, including those itemised above?"

Mr M Price replied:

"Construction Standards are reviewed periodically on a National basis through revisions to the Building Regulations.

The trend in recent years has been to provide increasing emphasis and control in respect of energy performance through the framework of the building regulations. For example works such as re-roofing a property or replacing a boiler are subject to building regulations approval and these works trigger an incentive to improve energy performance when such works are carried out.

In 2012 the Government introduced a consultation on changes to Part L of the Building Regulations (Conservation of Fuel and Power).

The Part L regulations set out the energy efficiency requirements for buildings and are key to the objective to facilitate introduction of the zero-carbon homes. The proposed revisions would see an 8% rise in carbon efficiency standards for new homes and 20% for commercial buildings. It is expected that these changes will not now come into force until April 2014.

Locally Shropshire Council has been developing the role and resource within its Energy Surveyor specialism, based within the Building Control team. The Energy Surveyor role specialises in sustainability and energy efficiency providing Code for Sustainable Homes assessments and construction energy performance certificates. Recognising the potential in this growing market the Energy Surveyor role will be complemented by an assistant drawn from the existing establishment.

Councillor Williams then identifies a number of proposals to achieve sustainable design. I have not commented in detail, a number of the points raised are aspirational and others covered by Development Management negotiations, all of which in Shropshire are informed by the Core Strategy Policy, particularly as embodied in Policy CS6 – Sustainable Design and Development Principles and the requirements of the National planning Policy Framework. I comment further as follows to the points raised by Councillor Williams:

i. That all houses should be built to a minimum of Sustainability Code Level 4, with preference given to tenders offering Level's 5 and 6. While increased standards are encouraged the Council cannot require developers to build higher to standards that exceed the requirements of the building regulations except in circumstances where the Council is procuring the work

ii. *That there should be no dilution of sustainability standards for social housing, which is the primary need for housing in Shrewsbury.*
Noted and same comment as (i) above applies

iii. *Plan to build to the best aspect, so as to use orientation for maximum solar gain and that photovoltaic's be included as standard.*
Noted and encouraged by Development management Officers in pre-application discussions – clearly aspect depends on a number of factors affecting site development layout

iv. *That building materials be sourced from local suppliers, not from the developer's own supply chain. Council must insist on this.*
This is a contractual issue between the Council and those tendering for business.

v. *Internally there should be flexibility of room plans i.e. that the design should allow for retro modification to allow for changing family needs over time. This can be achieved by introducing lightweight, fully sound-insulated panels, instead of developer's preference for the use of concrete block walls. The problem seems to be that many house plans specify load bearing walls when it would be desirable NOT to use such walls except where absolutely essential. There seems to be a mind-set regarding block walls, either aggregate or lightweight as the norm, which needs to be challenged.*

This is not our experience and most domestic internal walls are constructed with timber stud partitions which are flexible and adaptable.

vi. *Roof space – allow for loft extensions as useable hobby rooms, extension of living space etc. Don't allow roof joists/rafters to be introduced which are not load-bearing and also specify roof support members which do not render the loft space inaccessible.*

This now happens widely and most house builders provide a range of house types that facilitate the changing needs of families.

vii. *There should be careful planning of outlook and amenity i.e. build in and around existing features of the physical landscape and preserve trees, so as to ensure MINIMUM impact upon the natural environment. Working with knowledgeable organisations is of paramount importance to this end.*

Noted, a matter for planners and applicants to negotiate in accordance with Council policies and advice.

viii. *Be fully aware of the local flora and fauna and ensure it is integrated into the new development.*
As above.

ix. *Ensure that sustainable systems of transport, cycle-ways, pedestrian-ways are given highest priority.*

As above – green travel plans are a feature of many larger developments.

x. Car parking must be planned so as not allow parking on the footways as per Sutton Bridge Junction. In Besford House the parking could have been to the rear of the houses, as implied by the Conservation Officer! This results from squeezing in extra houses at the expense of amenity and circulation space.

Noted.

xi. Make estates less linear; introduce staggered building lines. The sculptural impact of the new build would generally be more pleasing without the usual boring uniformity.

Noted – a design issue to be raised by Development Management officers.

xii. Again, with regard to the new build - look to variations of textures and colour as opposed to bland uniformity.

Noted.

xiii. To achieve much of the above, it may mean utilising a more 'modern' approach to new build than is currently the case.

Noted.”

By way of a supplementary question, Mr J M Williams enquired about the standard requirements to be set by the Council for all new build development.

In reply, Mr Price indicated that the Council would always seek to achieve the highest standards possible.

(h) Received from Mr R Evans:

“I note the new procedure that has been put in place to speed up Council decision making and ask:

How will Shropshire Councillors and residents now be informed of any questions and comments made or raised by the public and Parish/Town Councillors concerning the item to be decided on.

How will Shropshire residents, including Parish/Town Councillors, hear and now be informed of any issues and concerns raised by Shropshire Councillors concerning the item to be decided on.

What notes and minutes will be taken and published of the meeting where the decision is made.”

The Leader of the Council, Mr K R Barrow, replied:

“A record of a decision taken by an individual Portfolio Holder will be recorded formally and put on the decision list of the Council as happens now with cabinet decisions. There will be no change in that regard. This will then form part of the legal record of the Council under the

Local Government Act 1972. There is no prescribed content or form of a minute and this can vary as a matter of individual choice and local custom. The purpose of a minute is to establish an accurate record of the decision taken, they are not to record what individuals may have said.

With regard to any questions or comments raised by the public including those of local councillors these will form part of the public record by being kept on file, they will not form part of the formal minute. Under legislation, therefore, all that is required is a record of the decision, it is not a requirement to have a record of the debate or of any questions raised. Having said this as I have said above there will always be a record kept on file of any questions raised by the public and responses given.”

By way of a supplementary question, Mr R Evans stated that electors had the right to know what is being said by their elected Member and asked if decisions would be taken behind closed doors.

In reply, Mr Barrow stated that decisions would not be made behind closed doors and considered that the new procedure would make decision making more democratic and open and in time would be welcomed by everybody.

(i) Received from Mr R Evans:

“In a recent circular from the Local Government Association (LGA) news was given of a £94m refund they had obtained for Local Authorities that was wrongly stopped by the Department for Education to help fund the Academy Programme. This follows the refund of £58m made last year.

I welcome this and congratulate the Local Authorities who combined and fought for this refund and agree it is a victory for mums, dads and all school age children. I note however Shropshire was not one of those who took part in this campaign but are to gain from this refund. As one of the lowest funded Local Authorities in England any extra money to help provide and support the education of our children is very very welcome.

To quote from the circular dated 7th June this money was

".....refund from the DfE in recognition of unfair cuts made to the money councils received in 2012/13 to deliver school support services....."

A little further on Cllr David Simmonds, chairman of the LGAs Children and Young People's Board is quoted as saying

"We are pleased to have helped councils secure the return of £94million in schools funding which was incorrectly taken from them in 2012/13. The payment is in addition to the £58million which has already been returned in compensation for cuts in 2011/12. This money is essential to providing vital support services to schools and students. This is ultimately a victory for mums, dads and their school age children,"

Can Council and residents be informed how the refund was worked out, how much we were given per child and how much in total Shropshire actually received both last year and this year. Also where and what was this extra windfall and unexpected money spent on last year and will be spent on this year please."

Mrs A Hartley replied:

"I understand that Cllr Evans has previously received an explanation regarding this refund. I am very pleased to provide that explanation today which provides me with an opportunity to demonstrate how funding for school support services has been protected as far as possible by this Council.

To confirm, LACSEG funding is for the Statutory and regulatory duties in connection with educating pupils in the county within maintained schools. This is Local Authority funding not Dedicated Schools Grant and therefore does not affect schools budgets in any way.

It covers the following LA budgets in 13/14:

- Speech Therapy Aids
- Music Service - Strategy and Management
- Education Welfare
- School improvement
- Asset management – education
- Governors Support - Strategy and management
- Children's Trust and Joint Commissioning
- School Funding Team
- Head of Learning and Skills/Children's services etc
- Strategic LA functions in relation to schools and services to schools - Finance, HR, IT, Office Accommodation, Legal etc
- Premature retirement cost/ Redundancy costs (new provisions)

In 2011/12 the LA was top-sliced £983,738 from its funding. This was part of the £28.5M that the LA had to save within this year which was apportioned across all council services. The £983k was not targeted specifically at Learning and Skills. The council then received a refund of £884,957 in 12/13 against the original top-slice as the original top-slice was disproportionate to the number of Academy conversions we had had in Shropshire at that time. As the £983k top-slice was part of the overall council savings it was returned to the overall council funding. During this period since funding was not withdrawn at the level identified the support services for education have not been reduced to the level of the top slice.

Similarly in 2012/13 the LA was top-sliced £1,671,024 from its funding. This was part of the £24M that the LA had to save within this year which was apportioned across all council services. Again the £1.671M was not targeted specifically at Learning and Skills. The council will receive a refund of £1,157,057 in 13/14 against the original top-slice as the original top-slice was disproportionate to the number of Academy conversions we had had in Shropshire at that time. Again as the £1.671M top slice was part of the overall council savings it will be returned to the overall council funding.

From 2013/14 onwards LA budgets as well as DSG budgets will be recouped based on actual academy conversions. At the present time this is expected to be approximately £500K based on known and potential academy conversions within this financial year.

The savings required by services provided to schools funded by LACSEG therefore was significantly less than would have been if the full cut to LACSEG was applied directly to the support services provided to schools. Therefore the services to schools were protected.

This Council in acknowledging the importance of education and the support services it requires allocates a budget of £5.65M whilst the Education Services Grant allocated to the Council is actually £4.761M

I also point out that this Council took the decision to underwrite the cost of continuance of broadband for 57 rural schools. The Council committed this funding from LA funds not DSG.

I am unable to explain the calculation used by Central Government to determine the level of Refund.”

By way of a supplementary question, Mr R Evans asked what would be happening with the additional £283,000 funding the Council received in May.

In reply, Mrs Hartley welcomed the return of the top-sliced money to the Council and indicated that this had been returned to the corporate budget headings from where it had been originally absorbed.

20. REPORT OF THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT

Mrs C Wild, presented her report, a copy of which is attached to the signed minutes, on undertaking her responsibilities as Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport and invited questions from Members.

Mrs Wild amplified her report and responded to questions, queries and concerns raised by Members, including Mr Adams, Mrs Barrow, Mr R Evans, Dr J Jones, Mr Kenny, Mr Mosley, Mrs Motley, Mr D Roberts, Mrs Shingleton, Mrs Taylor-Smith, Mr Tindall and Mr B Williams, during which the following indications and undertakings were given:

- Integrated Passenger Transport Service
A redesign of the service would be looked at to be applied across the whole of the Council's service.
- Shropshire Link/Community Transport
Usage of Shropshire Link had declined and the provision of the service in the future was being looked at along with all aspects of transport policy and encouraging community transport, including car clubs, increasing the number of volunteer drivers and more work being undertaken with parishes on the matter. The position in respect of follow up on the Task and Finish Group's Shropshire Link report would be dealt with at the next Cabinet meeting.
- Collaborative working with Cheshire West and Chester
Tenders for separate contracts had been sought jointly to achieve savings and further collaborative commissioning work would be pursued with Cheshire West and Chester.
- Hedge to Hedge working
The new approach for dealing with environmental maintenance issues was welcomed by Members and details of the policy would be provided to Members for onward circulation.
- Reinstatement works by Utilities Companies
A report would be considered at the next Cabinet meeting on action to improve the standard of reinstatement of the highway by Utilities Companies and it was hoped that the introduction of a permit scheme would achieve the improvements required.
- Culverts under roads
The need to increase the capacity of some culverts under roads to adequately deal with surface water run-off from the highway would be taken up with the Highways Design Team.

- Co-location with Mouchel
How arrangements for co-location with Mouchel were to be progressed would be considered at Cabinet.
- Consultations with Local Members
The need for early consultation with local Members on highways schemes would be taken up with the Highways Service.
- Cycling on pavements
Cycling on undesignated pavements was dangerous and anti-social and would continue to be tackled in liaison with the police.
- Ringway Contract
In relation to the flexibility of the Ringway contract, the company would have to undertake all that was required under the terms of the contract.
- Potholes
The way in which the filling of potholes in roads was addressed was being changed to increase efficiency. Figures on the number of complaints received and claims from motorists incurring damage to vehicles would be provided to Councillor D Roberts.

RESOLVED:

That the contents of the report be received.

21. REPORT OF THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Mr M Price, presented his report, a copy of which is attached to the signed minutes, on undertaking his responsibilities as Portfolio Holder for Built Environment and invited questions from Members.

Mr Price amplified his report and responded to questions, queries and concerns raised by Members, including Mr Bannerman, Mrs Barnes, Mr R Evans, Mr Mosley, Mrs Parry, Mrs Shingleton, Mrs Taylor-Smith, Mr Tindall and Mr J M Williams, during which the following indications and undertakings were given:

- Highley Housing Scheme being undertaken by the ALMO, Shropshire Towns and Rural Housing, and the planning process
Comments had been received on the quality and design of the dwellings and these had been taken up with the architects. With regard to responding to local concerns in the planning process and the viewing of drawings for schemes at committee, those issues would be looked into.

- Anti-social behaviour at social housing properties in Ludlow
The officers had been asked to keep the issues arising under review and Mrs Taylor-Smith and Mrs Parry would be kept informed of the action being taken to resolve the matter.
- Empty properties, delivery of affordable housing, investment in house building and standards in house building
It had to be accepted that a balance had to be struck in respect of standards in house building, if the Council wanted developers to build in Shropshire. Challenging poor standards in planning applications was welcomed. However, the Council could be placed at risk if applications that were turned down met with planning policies, so Members might need to consider changing planning policies. Bids would continue to be made for funding to bring empty properties back into use. The Government would be contacted on further investment in house building to assist economic recovery.
- New Homes Bonus
The amount to be made available to the Council for 2013/14 was awaited and as in previous years it would be spent wisely and fairly in being put to good use with the parishes.
- Flooding of properties in Temeside
Measures that could be taken to protect the properties in Temeside from flooding would be looked at in liaison with the Housing Team.
- Disabled Facilities Grants
A breakdown of the expenditure on Disabled Facilities Grants would be provided to Mrs Barnes.

RESOLVED:

That the contents of the report be received.

22. REPORT OF THE ENTERPRISE AND GROWTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

The Chairman of the Enterprise and Growth Scrutiny Committee, Mr S Davenport, presented the report, a copy of which is attached to the signed minutes, on the forthcoming work of the Enterprise and Growth Scrutiny Committee and invited questions from Members.

In presenting the report, Mr S Davenport indicated that the Committee intended to look at assistance to businesses and consider a petition for the introduction of 20mph speed limits in Oswestry.

RESOLVED:

That the contents of the report be received.

23. REPORT OF THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR ADULT SERVICES

Mr T Barker, presented his report, a copy of which is attached to the signed minutes, on undertaking his responsibilities as Portfolio Holder for Adult Services and invited questions from Members.

Mr Barker acknowledged that the transformation of Adult Services would be challenging, particularly bearing in mind the current financial pressures. Work would need to be undertaken with communities and the NHS in exploring the further integration of services and reducing the reliance on residential care would be examined.

Ms J Mackenzie expressed concern that appropriate consultations were undertaken with all service providers and stakeholders before any changes were made in the transformation of Adult Services. She stressed, with particular reference to the closure of day centres, that meaningful engagement was required so that those with learning difficulties understood the implications of the options.

Mr A Mosley, with Mr J M Williams, Mr R Evans and Mr Kenny indicating their support, expressed concern at the indications given in the report to the further privatisation of council services and emphasised the consequences of private operators not delivering the required standards of service in social care. He called for the establishment of a cross party commission to examine the reconfiguration of day centres and requirements for transformation of Adult Services and how these could be best achieved.

Mr Barrow indicated that he did not consider it necessary for a cross party commission to be set up but would welcome ideas coming forward from the other political groups for the transformation of Adult Services and working together to see what could be done.

Mr Barker thanked Ms J Mackenzie for her comments and confirmed that the council's responsibilities on the matter were well understood and work on that was being undertaken. He stressed that no decisions had been made yet on the future provision of any Adult Services and in respect of the reconfiguration of day centres this would be decided on 1st August 2013, with implementation over an 18 month period, and he did not yet know what action was to be proposed.

RESOLVED:

That the contents of the report be received.

24. REPORT OF THE HEALTHY COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

The Chairman of the Healthy Communities Scrutiny Committee, Mr G Dakin, presented the report, a copy of which is attached to the signed minutes, on the forthcoming work of the Healthy Communities Scrutiny Committee and invited questions from Members.

In presenting the report, Mr G Dakin drew attention to the extension of the Committee's remit to cover health and adult social care.

RESOLVED:

That the contents of the report be received.

25. REVENUE OUTTURN 2012/13

It was proposed by the Leader, Mr K R Barrow, and seconded by Mrs A Hartley that the report, a copy of which is attached to the signed minutes and the recommendations contained therein, be received and agreed.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That it be noted that the Outturn for the Revenue Budget for 2012/13 was an overspend of £0.284m, which represented 0.04% of the original gross budget of £653m.
- (b) That it be noted that the level of general balance stood at £6.820m, which was above the anticipated level included within the Financial Strategy and was therefore within the Council's policy to hold between ½ and 2% of the gross revenue budget.
- (c) That it be noted that the level of school balances stood at £4.953m (2011/12 £5.104m).
- (d) That it be noted that the Outturn for the Housing Revenue Account for 2012/13 was an underspend of £0.044m and the level of the Housing Revenue Account reserve stood at £1.041m (2011/12 £0.998m).

26. CAPITAL OUTTURN REPORT 2012/13

It was proposed by the Leader, Mr K R Barrow, and seconded by Mrs A Hartley that the report, a copy of which is attached to the signed minutes and the recommendations contained therein, be received and agreed.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the budget variations of £131,011 to the 2012/13 capital programme, detailed in Appendix 1&2a/Table 1 to the report and the re-profiled 2012/13 capital budget of £49.7m, be approved

- (b) That the re-profiled capital budgets of £78.6m for 2013/14, including slippage of £7.37m from 2012/13; £42.4m for 2014/15 and £16.1m for 2015/16, as detailed in Table 4 and changes in Appendix 2b to the report, be approved.
- (c) That the outturn expenditure set out in Appendix 1 to the report, of £42,280,455, representing 85.1% of the revised capital budget for 2012/13, be accepted.
- (d) That approval be given to the retaining of the balance of capital receipts set aside of £12.6m as at 31st March 2013 to generate a Minimum Revenue Provision saving of £496,000 in 2013/14.

27. ANNUAL ASSURANCE REPORT 2012/13

It was proposed by Mr B B Williams and seconded by Mr J Cadwallader that the report, a copy of which is attached to the signed minutes and the recommendations contained therein, be received and agreed.

RESOLVED:

That the Annual Assurance Report for 2012/13 be approved.

28. SCRUTINY COMMITTEES – REVISED NAMES AND REMITS

It was proposed by the Mr M Bennett, and seconded by Mr G Dakin that the report, a copy of which is attached to the signed minutes and the recommendations contained therein as amended by the insertion of the word “Scrutiny” between the words “all” and “Task” in recommendation (b), be received and agreed.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the Committee titles and remits set out in the report be endorsed.
- (b) That the political balance be relaxed for all Scrutiny Task and Finish Groups.
- (c) That the statutory powers for Health Scrutiny be delegated to the Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee.
- (d) That the named members of the Health and Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee be confirmed as members for the Joint Health Scrutiny Committee.

29. CREATION OF COUNCIL OWNED TRADING COMPANY

It was proposed by Mr L Chapman, and seconded by Mr D Turner that the report, a copy of which is attached to the signed minutes and the amended recommendations displayed at the meeting, be received and agreed.

Some Members, including Mrs C Barnes and Mr A Mosley, expressed concern at the lack of overarching business plans for ip&e and Tradeco and the apparent time taken to recognise the possible risk to the Teckal status and take protective action.

In response, the Leader, Mr K R Barrow, and Mr L Chapman confirmed that the business case for ip&e had been dealt with at Cabinet on 26th June 2013 and the total amount of the loans to ip&e and Tradeco would be £500,000. In addition, Mr Barrow and Mr Chapman emphasised the measured approach being taken and the clarity of the administration on the direction being taken by the Council and offered to brief Members on this if they so wished.

15 members requested a recorded vote on the proposition, the outcome of which was as follows:

For the proposition: (38)

Mr P Adams, Mr N J Bardsley, Mr T Barker, Mrs J B Barrow, Mr K R Barrow, Mr M Bennett, Mr T H Biggins, Mr J S Cadwallader, Mrs K D Calder, Mr D S Carroll, Mr L Chapman, Mr S F Charmley, Mr P A Cherrington, Mr G L Dakin, Mr A B Davies, Mrs P A Dee, Mr D W Evans, Mr E J Everall, Mrs E A Hartley, Mr J Hurst-Knight, Mr S P A Jones, Mr C J Lea, Mr D G Lloyd, Mr R J Macey, Mrs C M A Motley, Mr W M Parr, Mr M G Pate, Mrs D M Shingleton, Mrs R Taylor-Smith, Mr D Tremellen, Mr K Turley, Mr D R Turner, Mr A E Walpole, Mr S J West, Mr B B Williams, Mr L Winwood, Mrs T Woodward and Mr P A D Wynn.

Against the proposition: (16)

Mr A Bannerman, Mrs C A Barnes, Mr V Bushell, Mrs A M Chebsey, Mr J E Clarke, Mr R A Evans, Mr N J Hartin, Dr J E Jones, Mr J M W Kenny, Ms J Mackenzie, Mrs P Moseley, Mr A N Mosley, Mr K J Pardy, Mrs V Parry, Mr J Tandy and Mr J M Williams.

The proposition was carried with 38 Members voting in favour and 16 Members voting against.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That delegated authority be given to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader, to establish a Trading Company, operating in parallel to ip&e Ltd.

- (b) That delegated authority be given to the Chief Executive to agree a loan to Tradeco, if required, based on and no more than the totality of the existing loan already agreed with ip&e.
- (c) That the signatory on behalf of the Council as sole shareholder of the Trading Company will be the Head of Legal & Democratic Services.

30. STREET TRADING – DELEGATION OF POWERS TO OSWESTRY TOWN COUNCIL

It was proposed by Mr S Charmley, and seconded by Mrs R Taylor-Smith that the report, a copy of which is attached to the signed minutes and the amended recommendations circulated at the meeting, be received and agreed.

In response to a request from Mr A Mosley, the Leader, Mr K R Barrow, agreed to look into the possibility of similar powers being delegated to Shrewsbury Town Council.

RESOLVED:

That pursuant to the Local Government Act 1972, section 101(1)(b) all the functions concerning Street Trading as set out in Schedule 4 to the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982 be discharged by Oswestry Town Council in relation to that council's area and further, Oswestry Town Council discharge the functions set out in the said Schedule 4 in relation to those "consent streets" outside its area but within the boundaries of the former Oswestry Borough Council and contained in Appendix 1 to this report.

31. STATEMENT OF LICENSING POLICY

It was proposed by Mr S Charmley, and seconded by Mrs R Taylor-Smith that the report, a copy of which is attached to the signed minutes and the recommendations contained therein, be received and agreed.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the proposed statement of licensing policy as detailed in Appendix A to the report be approved and the Head of Public Protection be requested to consult, in accordance with relevant statutory requirements under the Licensing Act 2003, on the proposed policy and bring the policy back before the Council to enable consideration of any consultation responses prior to the adoption of the policy with effect from 1 April 2014.
- (b) That the parties to be consulted with about the proposed licensing policy be those referred to in Section 5 (3) of the Licensing Act 2003 (the Act) and where the Act refers to 'such persons as the licensing authority considers to be representative' authority be delegated to the Head of Public Protection to consult with such persons that he considers appropriate taking into account the guidance issued under Section 182 of the Act.

32. REGULATION OF INVESTIGATORY POWERS POLICY

It was proposed by Mr S Charmley, and seconded by Mrs R Taylor-Smith that the report, a copy of which is attached to the signed minutes and the recommendations contained therein, be received and agreed.

In response to a request from Mr Kenny, Mr Charmley agreed that arrangements would be made for member training on the policy.

RESOLVED:

That the proposed Regulation of Investigatory Powers Policy, as detailed in Appendix A to the report, be adopted with effect from 1 August 2013.

33. APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES

It was proposed by the Speaker, seconded by the Chairman and

RESOLVED:

That the following appointments to Committees be confirmed:

Safe & Confident Communities Scrutiny Committee:

The appointment of Mr D. Turner to replace Mr N. Bardsley.

Enterprise and Growth Scrutiny Committee:

The appointment of Mr N. Bardsley to replace Mr D. Turner.

Audit Committee:

The appointment of Mr J. Cadwallader to replace Mr P. Adams.

The appointment of Mr D. Carroll and Mr R. Macey to replace Mr T. Barker and Mr K. Roberts as substitute members.

Central Planning Committee:

The appointment of Mr J. Overall as a substitute member.

34. UPDATE TO PART 3 OF THE CONSTITUTION

It was proposed by the Leader, Mr K R Barrow, and seconded by Mr T Barker that the updated version of Part 3 of the Constitution setting out the Scheme of Delegation to individual Portfolio Holders, including specific delegations within the Portfolio Holder Role Descriptions, a copy of which is attached to the signed minutes, be received.

In response to a request from Mr R Evans, the Leader, Mr K R Barrow, agreed that Role Descriptions would be produced for Deputy Portfolio Holders.

RESOLVED:

That the updated version of Part 3 of the Constitution setting out the Scheme of Delegation to individual Portfolio Holders, including specific delegations within the Portfolio Holder Role Descriptions, be received.

35. REPORT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT OMBUDSMAN

It was proposed by Mr T Barker, and seconded by Mrs K Calder that the report, a copy of which is attached to the signed minutes and the recommendations contained therein, be received and agreed.

RESOLVED:

That the general principles set out in the Conclusions in paragraphs 8.1 - 8.6 of the report be supported, with authority to determine the final response to the Local Government Ombudsman delegated to the Director of Adult Services in consultation with the Portfolio Holder Adult Services Transformation and Safeguarding.

36. REPORT OF THE SHROPSHIRE AND WREKIN FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY

It was proposed by Mr S West and seconded by Mr J Hurst-Knight that the report of the Shropshire and Wrekin Fire and Rescue Authority, a copy of which is attached to the signed minutes, be received and noted.

In presenting the report, Mr West indicated that the forecast annual deficit by 2019/20 had risen to £1.2m to £1.9m and mitigation measures were being examined to address the position and consultations held before further consideration of action to be taken in September 2013.

RESOLVED:

That the report of the Shropshire and Wrekin Fire and Rescue Authority be noted.

Speaker

.....

Date

.....

The meeting closed at 12.55 p.m.