



UTTOXETER TOWN COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE VIRTUAL COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 12 JANUARY 2021 COMMENCING AT 7.00PM AND THERE WERE PRESENT:

Chair and Town Mayor – Councillor S McGarry

Councillors: M Crutchley, T Crutchley, D Goodfellow, C Green, H Headech, K Hudson, P Hudson, Z Krupski, K Smith, C Sylvester, L Sylvester, M A Trenerly, M Williams.

It was noted that County Councillor Brookes, one member of the local press and three members of the public were in attendance.

Prior to commencement of the meeting, the Mayor welcomed Members and Members of the Public and the Press Representative to the Virtual Council Meeting being held as in accordance with NALC L01-20 Regulation 5(2) of The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020 (which came into force on 4 April 2020 and apply to meetings taking place before 7 May 2021).

The Mayor reported that, as advertised within the Council's website, the meeting was available via <https://zoom.us/join> and that the Zoom Meeting ID was 983 0721 3031. She reported that the meeting was open to the public and the press unless the Council otherwise directs as in accordance with Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960. She reported that Members and Residents without computer access could participate within the meeting by telephoning 0131 460 1196 and by entering the Meeting ID. She reported that the virtual meeting was dependent on the internet and should a power cut take place, if the Meeting were unable to be reconnected, the meeting would be reconvened at a later date and time.

The Mayor reported that any Members who declared an interest in an Item included within the Agenda would be moved to the 'Waiting Room' during the debate and vote. She reported that the Clerk would bring those Members back into the meeting once a Resolution had been made.

1. **CHAIR'S WELCOME**

The Chair welcomed Members and Members of the public and press to the Meeting and reported that the meeting was being verbally recorded by the Council as in accordance with "The Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014".

2. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

(a) The Clerk reported that approved apologies had been received from Councillors J Fitchett and P Lancaster.

RESOLVED that the same be noted and approved

(b) The Clerk reported that no Councillors were absent where apologies had not been received.

RESOLVED that the same be noted.

3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

In accordance with Standing Order 3(e-g), the meeting be adjourned for up to 15 minutes to allow for public participation where members of the public may make representations, answer questions and give evidence at a meeting which they were entitled to attend in respect of the business on the Agenda.

The Mayor welcomed members of the public to the meeting. It was noted that one member of the public wished to address Council with respect to Agenda Item No. 18 - Response to the Content and Production of the ESBC's Uttoxeter Masterplan as Announced on the 21 December 2020.

Signed: Date:

The Member of the public reported “that many people in Uttoxeter did not know about the Masterplan which was now approved by ESBC. She stated that:

1. She had a question for Councillor McGarry as Mayor of Uttoxeter, why did you not ensure that adequate consultation was carried out?”
2. She advised Council that a Petition had commenced to request that the consultation be shelved, to be carried out post Covid and requested for it to go on the ESBC website.

The Mayor thanked the member of the public for addressing Council and reported that she would provide a response to the consultation under Item No. 18. The Mayor urged the Member of the public to make contact with ESBC direct with respect to inclusions within their website.

4. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Declaration of any disclosable pecuniary interest in a matter to be discussed at the meeting, and which is not included in the register of interests. Members are reminded that they are required to leave the room during the discussion and voting on matters in which they have a disclosable pecuniary interest, whether or not the interest is entered in the register of members’ interests maintained by the Monitoring Officer.

Councillor McGarry declared an interest in Item Nos. 22(a)-(b)

Councillor M A Trenery declared an interest in Item No. 19

Councillor C Sylvester declared an interest in Item Nos. 22(a)-(b)

Councillor Goodfellow declared an interest in Item Nos. 22(a)-(b)

5. **DISPENSATION PROCEDURE**

To consider and approve dispensation requests as in accordance with Standing Order 13(d), that all Dispensation requests shall be in writing and submitted to the Clerk as soon as possible before the meeting, or failing that, at the start of the meeting for which the Dispensation is required. Council will decide whether to grant the dispensation at the relevant meeting. Unless Council grant the relevant delegated power to Committee, it is Council that decides whether to grant the dispensation.

Council was reminded that as Resolved by Council at its meeting held on 1 June 2019, under Section 33 of the Localism Act 2011, all Town Councillors had been granted a Dispensation for setting the Precept for Uttoxeter until May 2023.

RESOLVED that the same be noted.

6. **MINUTES**

(a) The minutes of the Virtual Meeting held on 8 December 2020 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

(b) Council gave consideration to the Recommendations of the Virtual Working Committee Meeting held on 22 December 2020.

RESOLVED that the Recommendations of the Virtual Working Committee Meeting held on 22 December 2020 be approved and ordered to form part of the minutes attached hereto as Appendix A.

(c) Council gave consideration to the Recommendations of the Virtual Policy and Planning Committee Meeting held on 22 December 2020.

RESOLVED that the Recommendations of the Virtual Policy and Planning Committee Meeting held on 22 December 2020 be approved and ordered to form part of the minutes attached hereto as Appendix B.

It was noted that Councillor Goodfellow abstained from the above-mentioned vote.

(d) Council gave consideration to the Recommendations of the Virtual Finance and General Purposes Committee Meeting held on 22 December 2020.

RESOLVED that the Recommendations of the Virtual Finance and General Purposes Committee Meeting held on 22 December 2020 be approved and ordered to form part of the minutes attached hereto as Appendix C.

7. **ACCOUNTS**

- (a) Consideration was given to the list of accounts submitted for payment in the sum of £50,263.60.

RESOLVED that the list of accounts as above be accepted and approved, and the Mayor and Deputy Mayor be authorised to sign it.

- (b) Council gave consideration to the monthly summaries of the Council's income for December 2020.

RESOLVED that the same be noted.

8. **BANK BALANCES**

At 6 January 2021 the bank balances stood at:

RBS Current Account	£ 10,000.00
RBS Special Interest Account	£332,331.70
RBS General Reserve Fund Account	£100,000.00
RBS Town Mayors' Account	£ 1,540.49
RBS Deposit Account 32 Carter Street	£ 654.87
RBS 19A High Street Deposit Account	£ 324.79
Barclays Business Deposit Account	£ 75,000.00

Councillor Green requested that, in the short-term whilst new accounts cannot be progressed, as in accordance with Financial Services Compensation Scheme (FSCS), she requested Council considered transferring £10,000 to the Barclays Business Deposit Account from the RBS Special Interest Account to provide Council with protection of up to £85,000. Councillor C Sylvester seconded the proposition.

RESOLVED that the Clerk/RFO be tasked with transferring £10,000 to the Barclays Business Deposit Account from the RBS Special Interest Account to provide Council with protection of up to £85,000 under the Financial Services Compensation Scheme (FSCS).

It was noted that Councillor T Crutchley abstained from the above-mentioned vote.

9. **TOWN MAYOR AND DEPUTY MAYOR'S REPORT**

The Clerk reported that the Mayor had attended socially distanced visits to the local residential and nursing homes prior to Christmas.

10. **QUESTIONS**

- (a) To receive questions from members of Uttoxeter Town Council.

Councillor M Crutchley reported that he had sent a question prior to Christmas seeking an update on the progression of the 365 system for the office emails. The Mayor requested the Clerk provide an update. The Clerk reported that Council's IT Provider was providing options available to the Council due to the 365-domain name being registered to BT and the best way forward. The Clerk reported that she would continue to keep Council updated.

- (b) To receive questions from members of the electorate.
None received.

11. **REPORTS FROM COUNTY AND BOROUGH COUNCILLORS**

- (a) The Mayor reported that County Councillor Brookes was in attendance at the meeting. The Mayor suspended Standing Orders and invited County Councillor Brookes to address Council accordingly.

County Councillor Brookes expressed his thanks to the Council for allowing him to address Members however, on this occasion he wished to digress from his normal County Council update and wished to read out the contents of an email he had received last week requesting he pass on some sad news to the Town Council.

He reported that he had received an email from a former colleague, and former Town and Borough Councillor Lynne Shelton. County Councillor Brookes read out the contents of an email informing the Council that Lynne's health was deteriorating. She wished to express her sincere thanks to everyone in the community and for always listening. County Councillor Brookes reported that he was honoured to pass this information on for Lynne and that he was finding the situation very difficult. He paid tribute to Lynne, a genuine member of the community.

The Mayor expressed her thanks to County Councillor Brookes for bringing the situation to Council's attention and reported that the Council would make contact with Lynne to express its best wishes and to offer its support. The Mayor reinstated Standing Orders accordingly.

(b) The Clerk reported that no Borough Councillor Reports had been received.

12. REPORTS FROM MEMBERS WHO HAVE ATTENDED MEETINGS ON BEHALF OF THE TOWN COUNCIL

None.

13. ESBC – PARISH PRECEPT REQUIREMENT: UTTOXETER TOWN COUNCIL – GRANT SUPPORT AND TAX BASE FOR 2021/22

The Clerk reported receipt of an email and letter dated 4 December 2020 received from ESBC's Principal Accountant informing Council that the Local Council Tax Support Grant would be £23,695 and that "the Council Tax Base for the parish had been calculated. ESBC advised that it should be noted that the tax base for next year had reduced in order to account for the financial impact of the Covid-19 pandemic. Subject to ESBC's Cabinet meeting on 14 December 2020 to approve the calculation, the tax base would be 4,368.7."

Council was informed that ESBC confirmed the tax base rate of 4,368.7 on 14 December 2020.

RESOLVED that the same be noted.

14. ESTIMATES AND PRECEPT 2021/22

As Resolved by Council that an Extraordinary Council Meeting be convened, in private, on Tuesday, 24 November 2020 to give consideration to the Draft Estimates/Precept. Council was informed that the Draft Estimates/Precept shall be included for consideration by Council at its meeting scheduled to take place on 12 January 2021.

(a) Council gave consideration to the Draft Burial Fees for Uttoxeter Cemetery for 2021/22 which had been frozen at 2019/20 and 2020/21 Fees. Council's instruction was sought.

RESOLVED that the Burial Fees for 2021/22, be accepted and approved and ordered to form part of the minutes attached hereto as Appendix D.

(b) Council gave consideration to the Draft Town Hall Charges for 2021/22 which had been frozen at 2020/21 Fees. Council's instruction was sought.

RESOLVED that the Town Hall Charges for 2021/22, be accepted and approved and ordered to form part of the minutes attached hereto as Appendix E.

(c) Council gave consideration to the Draft Estimates and supporting budget notes for the financial year 2021/22 as considered by Council at its meeting held on 24 November 2020, as prepared and submitted by the Clerk/RFO and the Chair of the Finance and General Purposes Committee. Council's instruction was sought.

The Clerk/RFO reported that:

- (i) The Local Council Tax Support Grant of £23,695 had been included within the Draft Estimates/Precept for 2021/22.
- (ii) A reduced sum had been included for the Phase II works to the Kiosk following receipt of a quotation.
- (iii) As Resolved by Council on 24 November 2020, all Contingencies had been removed.
- (iv) £10,000 had been included under 4361/201 for the mechanical and electrical work only (as per the correspondence received from Council's Architect 5/1/21). It was noted that No installation costs had been included.

The Mayor and Chair of Finance and General Purposed reported that funding for the Contractor associated costs and for the proposed extension to Uttoxeter Cemetery would be funded by the Council's General Free Funds.

RESOLVED that the Estimates for the financial year 2021/22, as prepared and submitted by the Clerk/RFO and the Chair of the Finance and General Purposes Committee, be accepted and approved and ordered to form part of the minutes attached hereto as Appendix F.

- (d) Council determined the Precept Requirement for Uttoxeter Town Council for the financial year ending 31 March 2022.

The Clerk/RFO and the Mayor reported that the Tax-base for 2021/22 was 4,368.7 (in comparison to 4,439.9 for 2020/21) and that a Net Precept Requirement of £270,691 would provide a Parish Rate decrease to 61.96 (6.01 reduction in comparison to 67.97 for 2020/21).

It was noted that Councillor M Crutchley paid tribute to Council for not increasing the precept, which was down to his fellow Councillors, and for keeping costs as low as possible.

RESOLVED that the Precept Requirement for Uttoxeter Town Council for the financial year ending 31 March 2022 be £294,386 (Gross/Net Expenditure) less support tax grant allocation for 2021/22 of £23,695, providing a Precept Requirement of £270,691 (Net).

- (e) Council's permission was sought for the Town Mayor (and Chair of Finance and General Purposes Committee), the Deputy Mayor together with the RFO/Town Clerk to sign the completed Precept Requirement Form before submitting to ESBC in the sum of £270,691 (Net) Requirement to be issued to ESBC before 15 January 2021.

RESOLVED that the Town Mayor/Chair of the Finance and General Purposes Committee, the Deputy Mayor and the RFO/Town Clerk be authorised to sign the completed Precept Requirement Form to be submitted to ESBC in the sum £294,386 (Gross/Net Expenditure) less support tax grant allocation for 2021/22 of £23,695, providing a Precept Requirement of £270,691 (Net).

15. AREA OF REFLECTION

The Mayor reported she had received a telephone call from SCC's Deputy Leader for Highways on 18 December 2020 requesting the Council remove the WWI Commemorative Plaque located within the Market Square. She reported that, at this time, correspondence was awaited from SCC with respect to the removal of the plaque.

RESOLVED that this matter be included for further consideration by Council at its next meeting.

16. FINANCE AND GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

The Clerk reported receipt of an email dated 16 December 2020 received from Councillor C Sylvester requesting the Council's Finance and General Purposes Committee be held on the fourth Tuesday of the month commencing at 5.00pm. Council's instruction was sought thereon. Councillor C Sylvester reported that the afternoon meeting clashed with the Borough Council's Planning Committee and would be helpful to those working or in attendance at other meetings for the Finance and General Purposes Committee to commence at 5.00pm.

RESOLVED that, in future, the Council's Finance and General Purposes Committee be held on the fourth Tuesday of the month commencing at 5.00pm.

It was noted that Councillor Treney abstained from the above-mentioned vote.

17. UTTOXETER TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES AND SID SIGNS AND HIGHWAY UPDATE

Council was informed that the Clerk was continuing to liaise with SCC together with Councillors McGarry, Green and P Hudson with respect to the suggested locations and the installation of the SIDS signs within the Town together with improvements to speed signs and highway markings.

The Clerk reported receipt of an email dated 4 January 2021 received from SCC's Community Traffic Management Officer informing that Council's chosen Contractor was required to be registered with SCC to be able to be permitted to install the SID posts on highway land and that the Contractor would be required to apply for the necessary permits to dig for temporary excavations and that the Town Council would be required to apply for the necessary Section 50 for installation of private apparatus for each of the locations once they had been approved by SCC. The Clerk reported that SCC were currently reviewing the suggested locations and that an update was awaited.

RESOLVED that the same be noted and the Mayor and the Clerk continue to provide Council with updates accordingly.

18. RESPONSE TO THE CONTENT AND PRODUCTION OF THE ESBC'S UTTOXETER MASTERPLAN AS ANNOUNCED ON THE 21 DECEMBER 2020

Councillor Krupski requested this item be included within the Agenda and requested Council gave consideration to a response to the content and production of the ESBC's Uttoxeter Masterplan as announced on 21 December 2020. Council's instruction was sought.

Councillor Krupski reported that:

- The Uttoxeter Masterplan was passed by ESBC on the 21 December which had created a massive wave of protest against the appalling quality and content of the plan.
- There was in excess of 800 individual posts on local Facebook pages as the details of the plan were shared amongst Uttoxeter residents. He reported that he was aware that a local petition against the proposed Masterplan which had gone live eight hours ago already had 350 signatures.
- In a comment made by Councillor Allen he had stated that the Borough Council's adoption of the Masterplan shows a clear commitment to regeneration and as a local member of the town I know it will be welcomed by residents. Councillor Krupski stated that in his opinion, ESBC had failed to understand what residents wanted as the consultation period was woefully too short and did not include a vast number of stakeholders or our town's residents.
- He had been advised that Cushman and Wakefield (the American global leader in the commercial real estate industry) had been hired by ESBC and SCC to produce the Masterplan and the associated costs for producing the plan were in the region of £40-60k.
- He had personally spoken to many of our local retailers and organisations who have were not consulted and are totally against the vast majority of the proposals made in the said plan. Some local shops had stated that if these or similar proposals were initiated that they would cease trading in Uttoxeter.
- Considering the fact that the Town Council resolved to send Cushman and Wakefield specific views on what was generally required in the July Town Council meeting, he expressed the following concerns:-
 - (i) Who briefed Cushman and Wakefield on what was required from the Masterplan for Uttoxeter?
 - (ii) Clearly the Masterplan document had multiple revisions, had the Leader of ESBC and the Town Mayor have sight of these prior to the final draft, if not who did?
 - (iii) Did Councillors Messer's Goodfellow, McGarry, C Sylvester and P Hudson see sight of the Uttoxeter Masterplan document some seven days prior to the ESBC meeting on the 21 December?
- Councillor Krupski stated that he felt that it would have been evident at this stage that the Town Council's requirements and those of local residents were not being met.

Signed: Date:

- He reported that the Mayor had stated at the July Town Council meeting that one of the requirements she wanted was “improved infrastructure in the centre of the town with adequate parking.” He expressed his concern that how does the removal of 250 car parking spaces from the Maltings car park alone for non-required residential buildings equate to that aspiration?
- In addition, if the new Uttoxeter Masterplan was only prepared to prompt local discussion of what might be feasible as suggested by a Councillor Allen, why did our four Town Borough Councillors agree to spend such a significant amount of resident’s money in producing such an inaccurate and poorly thought-out vision?

Councillor Krupski proposed that "Given the serious lack of consultation, significant inaccuracies and failure to comply to the Neighbourhood Plan we demand that ESBC rescinds the Masterplan passed on the 21 December 2020 and initiates a new process of full and detailed consultation with all stakeholders, residents and Uttoxeter Town Council". Councillor Trenery seconded the proposition.

Councillor Trenery reported that:

- She felt that the so-called Masterplan Plus was a shoddy and paltry document drawn up by people who did not know what they are doing, for people who do not know what they are doing.
- She stated that the document was seriously inaccurate and incompetent, and failed to comply with the requirements of the Uttoxeter Neighbourhood Plan adopted by the people of this town at a referendum. She reported that she was astonished to hear that the Councillors here who are also members of ESBC thought it fit to support the plan at the ESBC vote just before Christmas.
- She wished to point out just some of the inaccuracies included within the documents and wished to talk about the Neighbourhood Plan as follows:
 - The inaccuracies show that the expensive consultants hired by ESBC had carried out little research or consultation, and certainly seem to have barely set foot in the town.
 - Most strikingly the document stated that the town’s population was 9,664. She raised concern on the other 5,000 or so residents excluded from their count.
 - She stated that the consultants had not included the Premier Inn within their count of hotel bedrooms.
 - She stated that there were sweeping but unfounded statements in the report, such as that older premises on the edge of town are falling into disrepair, or that there is no demand for office spaces, when flourishing local companies like Top-Cashback had to move out of town or build large extensions to increase their office space.
 - She agreed that the Maltings and Trinity Square (not The Trinity as included within the document) are in need of attention, but to say that Iceland is left as an isolated business in the Maltings, and that Trinity Square is largely empty is completely untrue. There are a number of flourishing businesses in the Maltings, and when she recently walked through Trinity Square, there was in fact only one unit was unoccupied. Plans to replace all these shops and stores with housing would be calamitous for these businesses and for the town.
- She welcomed the suggestion included within the report of the setting up of a formal Business Improvement District however, noted that this made reference to Cheadle and not Uttoxeter.
- With regard to the Neighbourhood Plan, she stated that the proposals directly contradict two major objectives of the Made Uttoxeter Neighbourhood Plan:
 - To rejuvenate Uttoxeter’s centre, increasing footfall by making it a more attractive place to visit, shop and hold community events.
 - To improve and retain key local connections to ensure that there is appropriate transport infrastructure and improved public transport to meet the proposed growth of Uttoxeter.
- She reported that the proposals for development in this revised Masterplan involve the almost total removal of the two major shopping centres and their adjoining parking spaces in town, together with the bus station and public toilets, and their almost total replacement by residential accommodation.
- There is no recognition of Uttoxeter’s role as a rural hub for surrounding villages, or its growing potential as a tourist centre, both of which are seen as priorities in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Signed: Date:

Councillor Trenergy stated that the Uttoxeter Neighbourhood Plan states clearly that ‘access to the bus station and car parking should be maintained’, and that non-retail uses will not be supported for ground level shop units unless a proposed alternative can be demonstrated not to threaten overall retail vitality and viability of the area. It is hard to see how the new Masterplan’s proposals can do anything other than threaten the vitality and viability of the retail area. She stated that the Neighbourhood Plan sees the bus station and train station as key assets for the town and its Policies seek to protect and enhance these to make the areas more pleasant for waiting and a more attractive gateway to the town for visitors. The proposals in the revised Masterplan to remove the bus station and public toilets and replace them with a small bus stand in a busy side street, and to remove almost all car parking for visitors to the town centre, would remove almost entirely any welcoming gateways to the town and deter locals and visitors alike from entering and using the town centre.

Councillor Trenergy reported that, in summary, she felt that the proposals in the revised Masterplan were ill-founded and directly contradict the Neighbourhood Plan and were unacceptable.

Councillor T Crutchley reported that she wished to add support to the statements made by Councillors Krupski and Trenergy. She reported that she wished to speak on behalf of the residents of Chamberlain Close and that included within the report were three option proposals for the Wheatsheaf site. She reported the following with respect to the options as suggested:

- Option A – A public footpath which goes under one of the new buildings frontage in Market Place.
- Option B – Considers 3-storey apartments fronting the public footpaths. She reported that the ground that is proposed on is higher than Chamberlain Close. It is suggested buildings are in keeping with those on Chamberlain Close. She stated that the buildings closest to the footpath in Chamberlain Close are 2-storey properties and that they would not be in keeping plus they would be overshadowed and overlooked by the 3-storey properties already on higher land.
- Option C – Has a path under the properties as Option A and also 3-storey apartments. She stated that Option C takes into consideration the green space on the Chamberlain Close development that the residents pay a management fee, a condition as part of the original planning consent.

Councillor McGarry reported that she wished to provide a response to the question as received from the Member of the Public with respect to consultation and reported that:

- The Consultation for the Masterplan was started very early in March 2020 once approval was given by ESBC.
- ESBC had issued an initial press release to let people know that work on the Masterplan had begun.
- Consultants were appointed and they began work to understand how the previous Uttoxeter Master Plan in 2003 had impacted the Town, what its successes were and where there were still gaps.
- One-to-one stakeholder engagement events took place in July and August. She stated that it was about this time when the Uttoxeter local newspaper reported that the Town Council had convened an Extraordinary Meeting to consider the questions being asked to key stakeholders. She reported that Town Councillors were also emailed direct to respond individually.
- She reported that the Public Consultation began in September for two weeks and prior to the consultation it had been advertised via press release to the ESBC's Council's media list and it was again covered by the local paper. She stated that there was also a social media campaign via ESBC's Twitter and Facebook accounts for the full duration of the consultation period.
- She stated that ESBC's social media analytics showed that the social media posts reached over 15,000 different users over the two weeks of the consultation. This was also shared on Facebook groups in Uttoxeter. “

Councillor Williams stated that the Town Council had been asked to provide its comments in July 2020 to help with the production of the document and in my view, to identify what could be implemented within Uttoxeter in the future for improvement it for its residents and visitors over the next 10-20 years.

Signed: Date:

Councillor Williams reported that the resulting Masterplan had updated the 2003 plan and had looked at possible ways to revitalise and regenerate the Town. She stated that, in her view, it was a concept policy document which was illustrative and had to align with the Uttoxeter Neighbourhood Plan made in March 2017 which was acknowledged within the plan. Given that the Masterplan is meant to involve future planning process and not replace them, she proposed that “Council accept the document as the next step in planning for the future, welcome public discussions that this publication has generated and, work with ESBC and SCC on further schemes as well as the sustainable transport and parking strategy schemes.” Councillor M Crutchley seconded the proposition.

Councillor Krupski stated that he had heard what Members had reported and further stated that he felt that the residents, local organisations and retailers had not been listened to and he questioned the value for money for the report as received from Cushman and Wakefield.

The Mayor reported that two proposals had been made and seconded and wished to put them to the vote.

The Mayor put forward Councillor Krupski’s proposition as recorded below to the vote:
"Given the serious lack of consultation , significant inaccuracies and failure to comply to the Neighbourhood Plan we demand that ESBC rescinds the Masterplan passed on the 21 December 2020 and initiates a new process of full and detailed consultation with all stakeholders, residents and Uttoxeter Town Council", as seconded by Councillor Trenerly.

The vote being 3 in favour of the proposition and 10 against the proposition. The proposition was lost.

The Mayor put forward Councillor Williams’s proposition as recorded below to the vote:
Councillor Williams proposition that “Council accept the document as the next step in planning for the future, welcome public discussions that this publication has generated and, work with ESBC and SCC on further schemes as well as the sustainable transport and parking strategy schemes”, as seconded by Councillor M Crutchley.

The vote being 10 in favour of the proposition and 3 against the proposition. The proposition was carried.

RESOLVED that Council accept the document as the next step in planning for the future, welcome public discussions that this publication has generated and, work with ESBC and SCC on further schemes as well as the sustainable transport and parking strategy schemes.

It was noted that Councillor Trenerly declared an interest in Item No. 19 and she was removed from the virtual meeting to the Waiting Room during the debates/votes.

19. SCC – PROPOSED TRAFFIC CONTROLS IN STAFFORD ROAD

The Clerk reported receipt of a letter dated 21 December 2020 received from SCC’s Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport in response to the Council’s letter dated 29 October 2020. Council’s instruction was sought thereon.

It was noted that SCC advised that:

- the site would be a Microprocessor Optimised Vehicle Actuation (MOVA) signalised junction complete with a 4g router, connected to the County’s hosted Urban Traffic Control (UTC) system.
- SCC would be able to enforce fixed time plans if needed. SCC envisage MOVA would handle any potential for traffic to build up.
- With regards to the Council’s request for solid white lines along Stafford Road and yellow boxes at the two junctions, SCC would not be able to ask the developer to provide these measures. Planning law required that developers only need to provide the infrastructure improvements needed for the development to proceed. Mitigation measures to provide the Hazelwalls development include a new roundabout along the B5013 and the traffic signalised junction along Stafford Road.

Signed: Date:

- There was no requirement for further mitigation measures. For this reason, SCC would not be able to insist that the developer funds these works as part of the development. In addition, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) makes it clear that planning obligations should not be used solely to resolve deficiencies in infrastructure provision if it is not directly related to the development.
- However, if it is a local priority then the County would be happy to help the Town Council consider funding these measures for themselves. These measures will be subject to the necessary statutory consultations e.g., Police who will then also be responsible for enforcement (e.g., yellow box junctions).
- The measures for solid white lines are subject to strict design criteria which are set out in the Traffic Signs Manual Chapter 5 and in many locations these may not be permitted.
- SCC estimate that a ball-park figure to design, consult, make the Orders and implement these measures would be in the region of £5K.

RESOLVED that the same be noted.

It was noted that Councillor Trenery was returned to the virtual meeting.

20. **SCC – ROAD TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS**

(a) **PTTRO 4213890 - TEMPORARY ONE-WAY ORDER, TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF ONE-WAY ORDER AND TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF NO WAITING AND LIMITED WAITING RESTRICTIONS FOR BALANCE STREET AND MARKET STREET**

The Clerk reported receipt of an email dated 18 December 2020 received from SCC informing Council that SCC had permitted a PTTRO 4213890 Order for a temporary one-way order, temporary suspension of one-way order and temporary suspension of no waiting and limited waiting restrictions for Balance Street and Market Street in operation from 4 January 2021 and it was anticipated that the works would be completed by 21 March 2021, as forwarded to Members on 18 December 2020 and incorporated within Council's website and social media.

RESOLVED that the same be noted.

(b) **PTTRO 4210116 - BRIDGE STREET (FROM ITS JUNCTION WITH CHURCH STREET TO ITS JUNCTION WITH TRINITY ROAD) - MARKET PLACE (FROM ITS JUNCTION WITH BRIDGE STREET TO ITS JUNCTION WITH MARKET STREET)**

The Clerk reported receipt of an email dated 18 December 2020 informing Council that the above-mentioned Order would come into operation on 11 January 2021 and the said works would commence on or as near as practicable to that date and were due to take place on the following dates and times: - 11 January 2021 between the hours of 07:30 and 17:00 - 10 February 2021 to 15 February 2021 between the hours of 07:30 and 17:00. The Order would remain in force for a period of 18 months, or until the carriageway works, which it was proposed to carry out on or near the road had been completed, whichever was the earlier, as forwarded to Members on 21 December 2020.

RESOLVED that the same be noted.

(c) **PROPOSED CLOSURE - PTTRO 4197497 B5013 ABBOTS BROMLEY ROAD, UTTOXETER**

The Clerk reported receipt of a copy of an email from SCC's Senior Permit Officer, Network Management Unit to County Councillor Brookes and R Rayson advising that SCC had been in regular discussions regarding the above-mentioned closure and were now in a position to ask SCC to re-advertise this closure for dates of 01/02/2021-28/05/2021. For information, there was also a linked TTRO for the temporary speed restrictions under reference 4220651.

RESOLVED that the same be noted.

- (d) **PTTRO 4220651 - TEMPORARY 40 MPH SPEED LIMIT AND DIVERSION OF VEHICULAR TRAFFIC A518 STAFFORD ROAD, UTTOXETER, LOXLEY LANE, LOXLEY, LOXLEY LANE, AND UTTOXETER ROAD, LOXLEY GREEN, UTTOXETER ROAD, WILLSLOCK AND B5013 ABBOTS BROMLEY ROAD, UTTOXETER**

The Clerk reported receipt of an email dated 6 January 2021 informing Council that the above-mentioned Order would come into operation on 1 February 2021 and the said works would commence on or as near as practicable to that date. It was anticipated that the works would be completed by 28 May 2021, as forwarded to Members on 5 January 2021.

RESOLVED that the same be noted.

21. TOWN CLERK REPORT

The Clerk reported that since the date of the last meeting and in conjunction with the Mayor, she had responded/actioned the following:

- (a) Various SPCA E-Bulletins and Training Bulletins, as forwarded to Members.
- (b) Various NALC CEO Bulletin, as forwarded to Members.
- (c) Daily GOV.UK Coronavirus Updates, as forwarded to Members.
- (d) Various SCC updates, as forwarded to Members.
- (e) Various emails from SCC providing details of the Covid-19 Hotspot Areas for w/c 7 December 2020 as forwarded to Members 8 December 2020.
- (f) Various emails from SCC providing community testing & hotspot stakeholder updates.
- (g) SCC - East Staffordshire - Community testing updates as forwarded to Members.
- (h) SCC - A new way to communicate dated 18 December 2020, as forwarded to be Members on 18 December 2020.
- (i) County Councillor Brookes kindly forwarded an update on the Lidl highway works dated 23 December 2020 as forwarded to Members on 4 January 2021.
- (j) Various emails from Support Staffordshire, as forwarded to Members.
- (k) Email from Tean Valley Meadow Nature Trust, as forwarded to Members.
- (l) Email from Les Kirk Clocks dated 22 December 2020 informing Council that the works to the Town Hall Clock as previously agreed will be carried out in 2021 due to current social distancing guidance.
- (m) Email from CPRE – Season’s Greetings as forwarded to Members on 22 December 2020.
- (n) Email dated 30 December 2020 as issued to the MP from a member of the public regarding the Uttoxeter Master plan proposals.
- (o) Email dated 5 January 2021 from the MP as copied to County Councillor Brookes, Councillors Allen and McGarry together with the Clerk regarding drainage/flooding within Wood Lane. Council is advised that County Councillor Brookes confirmed on 21 December 2020 that “this has been added to the additional funding for outstanding drainage works.”
- (p) SCC Service Announcement – Staffordshire Libraries and Arts dated 6 January 2021 as forwarded to Members.

RESOLVED that with respect to 21(a)-(p) as above, the same be noted.

It was proposed, seconded and carried that Councillor Green Chair the meeting for Item Nos. 22(a)-(b).

It was noted that Councillors Goodfellow, McGarry and C Sylvester declared an interest in Item No. 22(a)-(b) and they were removed from the virtual meeting to the Waiting Room during the debates/votes.

22. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Council gave consideration to the undermentioned Planning Applications:

- (a) P/2020/01453 - Erection of a single storey rear extension, 82 A Park Street.
- (b) P/2020/01433 - Erection of a covered teaching bay, Uttoxeter Golf Club.

It was noted that Members had been issued with a copy of the ESBC’s Planning Application Decision Notice List as issued since the date of the last meeting.

RESOLVED that with respect to the following Planning Applications:

- (i) P/2020/01453 as above, Council requested that ESBC's Planners give consideration to the right to light/sight line of the neighbouring properties and take into consideration any comments/concerns received and raised from the neighbouring properties prior to approval being granted.
- (ii) P/2020/01433 as above, Council had no comment to make at this stage.

It was noted that Councillors Goodfellow, McGarry and C Sylvester were returned to the virtual meeting. It was noted that the Mayor resumed the Chair.

23. **COUNCIL IN PRIVATE – PUBLIC BODIES (ADMISSION TO MEETINGS) ACT 1960**
Pursuant to Section 1(2) of the above Act it was requested that the public and press were not present due to the confidential nature of the business to be transacted and were asked to withdraw.

RESOLVED that the same be noted and approved.

24. **EXTENSION TO THE CEMETERY**

The Clerk reported that, advice had been sought with respect to the purchase of the potential extension to the Cemetery and Council was informed that the purchase, as confirmed with Council's Internal Auditor could be funded from Council's General Free Funds (at this time, proposed sums up to £50,000).

Council was informed that the following had been received from Council's Internal Auditor "A local authority graveyard is not under the faculty jurisdiction except in certain circumstances - e.g., it is consecrated. So, a faculty is not required to extend the area. But if the new area is to be consecrated then there is a procedure for doing this which starts with an inspection by the Archdeacon after the land has been purchased and prepared e.g., Fenced off. It becomes consecrated when the Bishop signs the sentence of consecration. At that point the consecrated land comes under the faculty jurisdiction."

The Clerk reported that the proposed extension would be consecrated and therefore require Faculty. She reported that the extension would require planning consent for a change of use (currently agriculture) and that an update on the proposed extension including valuation/survey, planning update, etc, would be included for consideration by the Working Committee at its meeting scheduled to take place on 26 January 2021.

It was noted that the Faculty for the water-pipe works, etc would be delayed being submitted as the Faculty, to keep costs to a minimum, would include the proposed extension to the Cemetery.

RESOLVED that the same be noted and the Clerk continue to provide the Working Committee continue to consider the proposed to the extension for the Cemetery.

25. **32, 34-36 CARTER STREET – REPLACEMENT ROOF**

The Clerk reported that Council was currently awaiting a quotation for the replacement of the roof for 32 Carter Street which would be carried out at the same time as the replacement roof for 34-36 Carter Street. Council was informed that it shall be funding the works to 32 Carter Street and Redfern Cottage Trust would be funding the works to 34-36 Carter Street.

RESOLVED that the same be noted.

26. **GARDEN OF REMEMBRANCE – CENTREPIECE**

The Mayor reported that JCB's Apprentices had provided the Working Committee with a presentation at its meeting held on 22 December 2020 and that Committee had provided feedback on the draft designs for the Cemetery Garden of Remembrance centrepiece. She reported that the Working Committee would continue to consider the designs prior to bringing the designs to Council for approval.

RESOLVED that the same be noted.

27. HMRC SUPPORT

The Clerk reported receipt of the Employer Bulletin – December 2020 Issue 87 as forwarded to Members on 10 December 2020.

RESOLVED that the same be noted.

28. STAFFING

(a) The Clerk reported that staff lieu time hours up to 31 December 2020 was 28¾.

RESOLVED that the same be noted and approved.

(b) Council was asked to give retrospect approval to authorise for Council's HR Provider to deal directly with DAS on behalf of the Council to resolve the matter accordingly, as unanimously agreed by Members via email on 18-19 December 2020 following an email being issued by the Mayor.

RESOLVED that the same be noted and approved.

(c) The Mayor provided Council with a brief update on Staffing matters since the date of the last meeting. She reported that as in accordance with the Government Guidance, Staff were working from home where possible.

The Mayor expressed her sincere thanks to the four Admin Staff for continuing to carry out the Council's services, working hard in the background during extreme circumstances.

RESOLVED that the same be noted.

(d) Staff Training – Council was asked to consider the following:

(i) Basic Working at Heights/Manual Handling – quotation received from The Training Society for on-site training for the four Admin staff in the sum of £350 plus £21.60 travel (dates to be advised in due course).

RESOLVED that the quotation received from The Training Society for on-site training for the four Admin staff in the sum of £350 plus £21.60 travel be accepted and approved, funded by the Training budget allocation.

(iii) Developing Effectiveness Communication and Media Strategies - SPCA Training – Council gave consideration to the full-time Admin Officer attending the Developing Effectiveness Communication and Media Strategies training on 27 January 2021 in the sum of £30.

RESOLVED that the same be noted and approved.

(iv) Good Employment Practice Training SPCA Training – Council gave consideration to the Office Manager attending the Good Employment Practice training on 24 February 2021 in the sum of £30.

RESOLVED that the same be noted and approved.

The Clerk reminded Members that they were required to complete the Equality and Diversity Training as emailed by the Office Manager prior to the end of January and to forward the Office Manager a copy of their certificates accordingly.

29. AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING

None.

The meeting closed at 8.08 pm.