

Item: 51/21

Title: To consider and agree to set the date for the Christmas lights turning on ceremony for Saturday 27 November 2021.

From: Cllr Plant

Issue: In order to prepare the event, the Council need to set the date now for planning and booking facilities as deemed appropriate.

Recommendations: That the Parish Council host a Christmas lights event. This follows on from previous years and aims to have public participation, national guidelines allowing. The Council is invited to consider Saturday 27 November 2021 to be appropriate and the Christmas events committee can set a date for a meeting possibly July 2021.

Background: The Christmas lights is becoming a popular event in the Colwich Parish Council calendar. Following the Prime Minister's announcement on 22nd February it is anticipated that by December 2021, events will be able to run as normal. However, if pandemic guidelines are reintroduced in the autumn then the Council will take steps to ensure everyone's safety, as in 2020, with a virtual turn on event. The location of the formal turn-on event to be decided later depending on progress of works at the JPF.

Supporting Documents: None

Item: 52/21

Title: To consider and agree to mark HM The Queen's Platinum celebrations in June 2022.

From: Cllr Plant

Issue: The Parish Council proposed to mark the anniversary of VE Day by holding a number of village events over the weekend of May 8-10th 2020. Due to the international pandemic, this was cancelled. However, many villages groups were keen to be involved and much planning had taken place.

Recommendations: The Council is invited to consider marking this with a similar and appropriate celebration. The Parish Council plan for a Platinum Event for the weekend commencing Friday 3 June 2022 using the initial plans drawn up for the VE Day weekend. If the Council agree to this, the first meeting should be held in June 2021

Background: A special four-day Bank Holiday weekend will be created to celebrate the Queen's Platinum Jubilee in 2022. On Feb 6 2022, the Queen will have reigned as monarch for 70 years - the first time a British sovereign will have been on the throne for seven decades. The government has announced the extra Bank Holiday will be held on Friday 3 June 2022 to make it a four-day Bank Holiday weekend.

Supporting Documents: None

Item: 53/21

Title: To consider holding an extra Full Council Meeting on a regular basis to report and review the progress of Parish Projects.

From: Cllr Bloor

Issue: Currently the progress of a project is discussed either as an individual agenda item or by reference to the Resolution Tracker. Prior to the Covid outbreak the project would also be discussed in whichever Committee it was assigned to. Now that a leader/co-ordinator has been appointed for each individual project it is possible for that leader to report back to a Full Council meeting. This is particularly pertinent as we do not have any established Committees at present.

Recommendations: In order to give adequate time to the discussion of progress on each Parish project, I propose that on a regular basis (possibly once every 3 months) we have a scheduled Full Council meeting specifically dedicated to Projects. In this way each project leader can give feed-back as to how that project is progressing and highlight any area where hold-up is occurring. As we are now having less meetings due to there being no Committees then this should not be too onerous an undertaking.

Background: There have been concerns expressed that certain projects have been allowed to drift and consequently no progress has been made. If a specific meeting were to be held whereby each project leader reported back on a regular basis then Councillors would be made aware of any particular problems being encountered & discussion could take place as to how to solve these. By dedicating a meeting solely for this purpose then sufficient time could be taken to discuss each project. At the present time often outstanding issues on the Resolution Tracker are dealt with speedily at the end of a meeting & insufficient consideration is given to particular points.

A disadvantage of agreeing to this proposition would be that an extra Council meeting would be needed approx. once every 12 weeks. However, the advantage could be that the regular monthly meetings would have less Agenda items and thus be less onerous.

Supporting Documents: None.

Item: 54/21

Title: To consider the need to give higher priority to renovations to the Parish Centre.

From: Cllr Bloor

Issue: The Council recently prioritised the projects that it would like to pursue during the coming financial year. The Parish Centre was placed lower down the list than those projects that we chose to actively take forward at this time. Due to changed financial circumstances (allocation of 106 money) & further consideration of the Building surveyor's report of 2016 it would seem pertinent to revisit the priority status of the Parish Centre. It seems to be increasingly urgent that at least some renovations need attention.

Recommendations: Discuss whether the Council should move the renovation of the Parish Centre higher up the priority scale & consider whether there is sufficient finance available to commence work on some or all the areas that need repair/renewal.

Background: The Parish Centre is small for the Council's needs and consequently all space needs to be maximised. The toilet facilities are poor & in need of repair; In the interests of the staff who work in & from the Centre they need to be put into full working order. Members of the public and Councillors also spend time in the Centre from time to time and should be welcomed into a pleasant & healthy environment. A building survey was completed several years ago that highlighted where areas of work were needed then, since that time the Centre has deteriorated.

To do nothing does not seem to be an option as it is unacceptable to allow property used and owned by the Parish Council to fall into disrepair.

Supporting Documents: The Building Surveyor's Report completed in 2016 which Councillor Dunn has already posted on Teams – Parish Centre (Maintenance).

Item: 55/21

Hello

It was agreed at yesterday's TVCG meeting that a joint response to the HS2 Consultation should be sent from the Trent Valley Parish Councils and this would be prepared by a Weston resident who has a lot of knowledge regarding the impact of HS2 on our area.

Please see attachments below.

If you would like your Parish Council to be represented by this response, please confirm - to myself and to David Croxford (parishclerk@westonstaffs.org.uk) - that you are happy with it.

The deadline is this Friday - February 26th.

Many thanks

Catherine Gill

Clerk to Hixon Parish Council

Item: **56/21**

Title: Consider and Agree to develop a Parish Council Risk Register and associated policies and procedures.

From: Cllr Rattray

Issue: We do not appear to have a Council Risk Management Policy and Risk Register. The register should also be reviewed as part of developing budgets and plans.

Recommendations: Agree actions and timeline to produce the risk register and associated policies and procedures. An example parish council risk register is attached.

Background: Unsure if we have one, could not find.

Supporting Documents: Example risk-management-policy-and-risk-register

Item: 57/21

Title: Consider and Agree to produce Annual Report for 2020/21.

From: Cllr Rattray.

Issue: Annual Report was not produced for 2019/20, we should produce one for 2020/21

Recommendations: Develop Annual report and publish as soon as possible in new financial year.

Background: The Annual Report serves as a transparent account of what the Council has accomplished over the past year, and to communicate developments which might affect the parish in the coming year.

We used Covid and the fact that the Annual Parish Meeting was not taking place as the reason for not publishing, this did not stop other councils publishing their report.

Supporting Documents: Example Annual Report 2018-19

Item: 58/21

Title: Consider and Agree response expectations

From: Cllr Rattray.

Issue: As per agenda item 10/21, meeting January 13th. Attached is Draft Expectations Grid for discussion.

Recommendations: Agree response expectations, implement and monitor.

Background:

Agenda items.

- No acknowledgement is received when councillors send proposed agenda items
- No communication is sent if an agenda item is not included, giving reason why

Notification off Absence:

- No acknowledgement is received when councillors send apologies

E-mail requests for information/assistance:

- No acknowledgement is received
- No agreed response times

Supporting Documents: Draft - Expectations Grid (councillor Support)

	Acknowledgement	Answer
Agenda Item Receipt	1 working day	1-3 working days - acceptance of papers
Abscense	1 working day	N/A
E-mail Councillor Request	1 working day	1-3 working days - response to request
Teams Conversation	1 working day	1-3 working days - response to request
Phone - Office	same day	1-3 working days - response to any request
Phone - Mobile	same day	1-3 working days - response to any request
Text	1 working day	1-3 working days - response to any request

Item: 59/21

Title: Consider and Agree to hold key documents in Sharepoint (MS365)

From: Cllr Rattray.

Issue: Key documents are not held electronically, in one place, which is secure and accessible to all councillors:

- Supplier contracts and schedules
- Tender documentation – tender, quotes, selection criteria etc.
- Risk Assessments
- Documented Acceptances of works carried out
- Letters sent on behalf of the council and any responses

Recommendations:

Although this is part of the bigger project regarding document management, recent issues suggest that this should be done as a priority.

All identified documents to be stored electronically in Sharepoint.

Background: This issue was raised in an e-mail on 18th January, no action was taken.

All these documents need to be held in secure and accessibly place. For transparency and in the event that the clerks are not available.

JPF tree cutting is an example, councillors were left unsure about what work was actually contracted.

Supporting Documents: None

Item: 60/21

Title: Consider and Agree to Review the Neighbourhood Plan

From: Cllr Rattray.

Issue: The Neighbourhood plan was adopted in 2016, the plan is due for review (every 5 years). It is an ideal time to review the plan in conjunction with all the developments in last 5 years and the census 2021.

Recommendations: Review and publish updated plan.

Background: The plan forms part of our strategic objectives and aims. It is due a review after 5 years.

Significant developments have taken place since the plan was published

The 2021 census will influence a revised plan

Supporting Document: Colwich-Neighbourhood-Plan-Referendum

Guidance

Neighbourhood planning

The guidance explains the neighbourhood planning system introduced by the Localism Act, including key stages and considerations required.

[Neighbourhood planning - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](http://www.gov.uk)

Updating a neighbourhood plan

In what ways can a neighbourhood plan or order be changed?

There are 3 types of modification which can be made to a neighbourhood plan or order. The process will depend on the degree of change which the modification involves:

- Minor (non-material) modifications to a neighbourhood plan or order are those which would not materially affect the policies in the plan or permission granted by the order. These may include correcting errors, such as a reference to a supporting document, and would not require examination or a referendum.
- Material modifications which do not change the nature of the plan or order would require examination but not a referendum. This might, for example, entail the addition of a design code that builds on a pre-existing design policy, or the addition of a site or sites which, subject to the decision of the independent examiner, are not so significant or substantial as to change the nature of the plan.
- Material modifications which do change the nature of the plan or order would require examination and a referendum. This might, for example, involve allocating significant new sites for development.

Paragraph: 106 Reference ID: 41-106-20190509

Revision date: 09 05 2019

When will it be necessary to review and update a neighbourhood plan?

A neighbourhood plan must set out the period for which it is to have effect ([section 38B\(1\)\(a\) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004](#)). Neighbourhood plan policies remain in force until the plan policy is replaced.

There is no requirement to review or update a neighbourhood plan. However, policies in a neighbourhood plan may become out of date, for example if they conflict with policies in a local plan covering the neighbourhood area that is adopted after the making of the neighbourhood plan. In such cases, the more recent plan policy takes precedence. In addition, where a policy has been in force for a period of time, other material considerations may be given greater weight in planning decisions as the evidence base for the plan policy becomes less robust. To reduce the likelihood of a neighbourhood plan becoming out of date once a new local plan (or spatial development strategy) is adopted, communities preparing a neighbourhood plan should take account of latest and up-to-date evidence of housing need, as set out in [guidance](#).

Communities in areas where policies in a neighbourhood plan that is in force have become out of date may decide to update their plan, or part of it. The neighbourhood area will already be designated, but the community may wish to consider whether the designated area is still the most suitable area to plan for.

Paragraph: 084 Reference ID: 41-084-20190509

Revision date: 09 05 2019 See [previous version](#)

How are minor neighbourhood plan or Order updates made?

Minor (non-material) updates to a neighbourhood plan or Order would not materially affect the policies in the plan or permission granted by the Order. A local planning authority may make such updates at any time, but only with the consent of the qualifying body. Consultation, examination and referendum are not required.

Paragraph: 084a Reference ID: 41-084a-20180222

Revision date: 22 02 2018

How are more substantive neighbourhood plan updates made?

If a qualifying body wish to make updates (modifications) that do materially affect the policies in the plan, they should follow the process set out in [guidance](#), with the following additional requirements:

- the qualifying body must (at the pre-submission publicity and consultation stage and when the modified plan is submitted to the local planning authority) state whether they believe that the modifications are so significant or substantial as to change the nature of the plan and give reasons
- the local planning authority must (when sending the modified plan to the independent examiner) state whether they believe that the modifications are so significant or substantial as to change the nature of the plan and give reasons. The local planning authority must also submit a copy of the original plan to the independent examiner
- the qualifying body must decide whether to proceed with the examination after the examiner has decided whether the modifications proposed change the nature of the plan

Paragraph: 085 Reference ID: 41-085-20180222

Revision date: 22 02 2018 See [previous version](#)

Do neighbourhood plan updates require a referendum?

Where material modifications do not change the nature of the plan (and the examiner finds that the proposal meets the basic conditions, or would with further modifications) a referendum is not required. A local planning authority will be required to make the modified plan within 5 weeks following receipt of the examiner's report, or such later date as agreed in writing between the local planning authority and the qualifying body.

Where material modifications do change the nature of the plan, the local planning authority would publicise and consider the examiner's report in line with the procedure for making a new neighbourhood plan. A decision may be made whether to proceed to referendum so that, if the referendum is successful, the neighbourhood plan becomes part of the development plan. A decision may be made whether to proceed to referendum so that, if the referendum is successful, the neighbourhood plan becomes part of the development plan.

Paragraph: 085a Reference ID: 41-085a-20180222

Revision date: 22 02 2018

How is the decision on whether modifications change the nature of the plan made?

Whether modifications change the nature of the plan is a decision for the independent examiner. The examiner will consider the nature of the existing plan, alongside representations and the statements on the matter made by the qualifying body and the local planning authority.

Neighbourhood plans can shape and direct sustainable development in their area. If the original plan primarily shapes growth through measures such as design policies, then modifications seeking to take forward these policies through design codes would be unlikely to change the nature of the plan.

Paragraph: 086 Reference ID: 41-086-20190509

Revision date: 09 05 2019 See [previous version](#)

Is it possible to modify a neighbourhood plan to correct an error?

Yes. [Section 61M\(4\) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990](#), (as applied to neighbourhood plans by section 38C(2)(c) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) enables a local planning authority to modify a neighbourhood plan or order they have made for the purpose of correcting errors. The relevant qualifying body (if it still exists) must consent to the modification.

Paragraph: 087 Reference ID: 41-087-20160519

Revision date: 19 05 2016

Item: 61/21

Title: Consider and Agree to review the Green Infrastructure Plan.

From: Cllr Rattray.

Issue: The plan was developed in 2017 and does not appear to have been reviewed. There does not appear to be an action plan for delivering changes identified within the plan.

This is a key document influencing and delivering the council strategy, objectives and aims.

Recommendations: The plan is revised and actions identified. I would suggested that this is done in conjunction with the JPF and “Memorial” work.

Background: The only action that is visible from the plan is the River of Flowers, however there does not appear to be any updates on this since 2018.

This document and the neighbourhood plan are key documents feeding into council strategy, objectives, aims and plans for the next 1 year, 3, year, 5 years.

Supporting Documents: Green infrastructure plan v2.1 Sept17

Item: 62/21.

Title: To consider and agree if the Parish Council wish to start a book swapping initiative, and if so, what the next steps are.

From: Cllr Upton-Loach.

Issue: A local resident has requested the creation of a book swapping scheme. Books would be kept publicly accessible, in something like a telephone box, people may then swap books out of the mini library. We do not have a telephone box in the villages, so maybe a box of some kind could substitute.

Recommendations: The council should consider what the books would be kept in, suggestion of a box on the side of the council building.

With the current covid situation the council would need to put in place measures to ensure the books are being isolated for a suitable period of time. My suggestion for this would be three book boxes – one with books that could be ‘borrowed’ in and two for returning books, these would be put out alternately, so the books in the first box have a week to decontaminate before they are put back in with the books waiting to be ‘borrowed’.

Background: There are several books swaps in other villages. Including Brocton and Hixon. The creators of these could be contacted if needed.

Photo below is from the Facebook post a resident posted suggesting the book swap scheme.



Supporting Documents: None.

Item: 63/21.

Title: To Consider and Agree to develop a Parish Council Programme Plan including project monitoring Record.

From: Cllr Dunn.

Issue: A simple method of recording and monitoring the progress of Council Projects, including costs, is required to ensure both Clerks and Councillors are informed in a timely manner and to provide an auditable record of activities. The Programme Plan would also support the development and review of budgets.

Recommendations: To consider the development of a Programme Plan, and agree actions and timeline to produce Programme Plan and associated procedures. A draft Programme Plan is provided under Supporting Documents below.

Background: The Council has many ongoing and new projects/tasks are regular identified. A simple method of recording key information and monitoring progress is required to ensure Clerks and Councillors are kept informed. The use of such a programme will also enable: Project Leads to be identified and provide regular updates via the Plan; visibility of timelines; agreed funding lines and expenditure to be identified; and to provide an auditable record of actions.

Supporting Documents: Draft Programme Plan - (Full Council/General/Files/ Programme Plan (Draft) v0-2)

Item: 64/21

Title: To Consider and Agree the way forward for the JPF and GHMH Drainage Projects.

Issue: Porosity Tests have been completed at the GHMH and JPF Car Park by Drainage & Construction Services Ltd, Mr Andy Young, and Reports received and circulated to Clerks and Councillors for their perusal. No comments have been returned. A decision is required on how to move this work forward.

Recommendations: To consider Options 1 & 2 and the inclusion of rainwater harvesting as detailed below and determine how to proceed with the drainage and resurfacing of the JPF Car Park.

Note. If Option 2 is selected then confirmation of Severn Trent's acceptability to connect the surface water drainage to their foul sewer is recommended before undertaking the design stage to prevent nugatory works from occurring.

Background: Both the GHMH and JPF Car Parks have flooding issues with surface water running off the GHMH Car Park into adjacent gardens and causing localised flooding and severe ponding occurring in the JPF Car Park. An initial investigation was conducted by Drainage & Construction Services Ltd (DaS Ltd) and recommendations made to undertake porosity tests. The porosity tests have been completed at both the JPF and GHMH Car Parks and Reports received from DaS Ltd.

GHMH Car Park.

The Report stated that the porosity tests confirmed the provision of one or more soakaways is feasible but recommended, in light of concerns over ground stability and indirect flooding of the adjacent gardens, that the preferred option would be to connect to Seven Trent's surface water sewer that runs under the car park. The Recommendation being to approach Seven Trent again and seek a direct connection to their surface water sewer. A letter is being drafted for the GHMH Executive Committee to send to Severn Trent. No further action is required by the Parish Council at this time.

JPF Car Park.

The Report stated that the porosity tests confirmed that the provision of one or more soakaways under the car park surface is not a viable option and provided two alternative options.

1. Option One would see a further porosity test conducted in the grass area to the left of the entrance from the car park to the field area and if found suitable a soakaway could be installed and the car park surface provided with drainage gullies and reprofiled to drain towards the new soakaway in the grass area. A swale along the longitudinal length of the car park would also be provided for additional storm storage. DaS Ltd believe in extreme weather it is likely this solution will see the flooding move to the grass area which may affect the footpath to the playground area and the top field. There is also considerable cost in reprofiling the car park level to ensure the grass area is at a low point.

2. Option 2, DaS Ltd's preferred solution, recommends the reprofiling of the car park and provision of drainage gullies to enable a connection to be made to the public sewer located in the corner of the JPF by the toilet block. This will require extensive reprofiling of the car park, careful design to prevent a low spot by the entrance to the playground area and top field, and Severn Trent may require the provision of on-site storage. DaS Ltd indicate car park gradients are tight and a topographical survey will be required to determine levels.

The Report also discusses proposed surfaces, both porous and impermeable, for the car park surface including their advantages and disadvantages. Rainwater harvesting is also discussed and notes that the roof drainage can only be used for flushing toilets and the car park drainage could only be used for irrigation and washing down as it may be contaminated with oils. The latter is not recommended by DaS Ltd for this project and no comment is made on harvesting the roof drainage other than it is unlikely to be cost effective.

The Deputy Clerk was asked to review the Waterplus invoice for the JPF to confirm the Parish Council pays for surface water drainage. Unfortunately, no invoice could be found and it cannot be confirmed that the Parish Council has permission to discharge surface water drainage into Severn Trent's sewer. This would be needed if Option 2 is selected.

I have spoken with DaS Ltd, Mr Andy Young, and he has advised he has the capability to undertake the topographical survey and design of the car park surface incl. drainage, irrespective of which option is chosen, and provide a design specification and drawing package for tender purposes. If required, he could also undertake: a technical review of the returned tenders to enable the Parish Council to determine which offers value for money; act as Clerk of Works and oversee the construction works; and sign-off on completion.

In summary, a decision is required on which Option to follow:

Option One will require further porosity tests to be undertaken and may lead to localised flooding in the grass area adjacent to the gate to the playground area and top field – this is not DaS Ltd's preferred option.

Option Two will enable the Parish Council to move onto the design stage of the car park and drainage service but will require Severn Trent's permission to connect to their foul sewer; which the Parish Council currently does not appear have.

A decision on the inclusion of rainwater harvesting from the roof drainage is required, as is a decision on the car park surface. With the latter, it would be feasible to include options covering two or more surface materials within the tender package for the contractor to price with a decision on affordability taken at the tender stage.

Supporting Documents: 1. JPF Car Park, Porosity Report (Jan 21) (Sharepoint–E&L/Flooding/Files/JPF)
2. Memorial Hall Car Park, Porosity Report (Jan 21) (Sharepoint–E&L/Flooding/Files/GHMH)