

# Public Document Pack



**PLEASE NOTE THAT THIS MEETING WILL COMMENCE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING  
THE CLOSING OF THE SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING**

Dear Sir/Madam,

You are summoned to attend the meeting of the Borough Council of Newcastle-under-Lyme to be held in the **Jubilee 2 - Dance Studio - (Second Floor) - Brunswick street, Newcastle, Staffs** on **Wednesday, 19th May, 2021** at approximately 7.30 pm on the rise of the prior **Special Meeting of Council**.

## **B U S I N E S S**

### **1 APOLOGIES**

### **2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

To receive declarations of interest from Members on items contained within this agenda.

### **3 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

**(Pages 5 - 26)**

To consider the minutes of the previous meeting(s)

### **4 ELECTION OF MAYOR 2021/22**

When the Mayor has declared the result of the election, the Mayor, preceded by the Mace Bearers, will retire from the room, accompanied by the Chief Executive and the Mayor Elect.

The Mayor Elect will then be robed and invested with the chain of office. The Mayor Elect will then return to the meeting room preceded by the Mace Bearers and accompanied by the Chief Executive.

The Mayor will take the chair and make the declaration of acceptance of office.

### **5 APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY MAYOR 2021/22**

Following the appointment of the Deputy Mayor, he/she will make the declaration of acceptance of office.

### **6 MAYORAL APPOINTMENTS**

The Mayor will announce appointments to Civic Roles for the forthcoming year.

**7 MAYORAL ADDRESS**

To receive the Mayoral address.

**8 VOTE OF THANKS TO THE RETIRING MAYOR AND MAYORESS**

In appreciation of their services during the past year, the Group Leaders will lead a vote of thanks to the retiring Mayor and Mayoress.

**9 RESPONSE OF THE RETIRING MAYOR AND SUMMARY OF THE MAYORAL YEAR**

Retiring Mayor's response.

**10 APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET**

The Leader will report the appointment of his Cabinet and Deputy Leader for 2021/22.

**11 APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES, CHAIRS AND VICE CHAIRS (Pages 27 - 36) FOR 2021/22**

To appoint Members to committees.

**12 EXTERNAL ROLES AND APPOINTMENTS (Pages 37 - 55)**

**13 CALENDAR OF MEETINGS 2021/22 (Pages 57 - 67)**

**14 CONFIRMATION OF THE CONSTITUTION (Pages 69 - 70)**

**15 URGENT BUSINESS**

To consider any communications which pursuant to Appendix 7, Procedure Rule 8 of the constitution are, in the opinion of the Mayor, of an urgent nature and to pass thereon such resolutions as may be deemed necessary.

**16 DISCLOSURE OF EXEMPT INFORMATION**

To resolve that the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following report(s) as it is likely that there will be disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs contained within Part 1 of Schedule 12A (as amended) of the Local Government Act 1972.

Yours faithfully



Chief Executive

## **NOTICE FOR COUNCILLORS**

### **1. Fire/Bomb Alerts**

In the event of the fire alarm sounding, leave the building immediately, following the fire exit signs..

On exiting the building Members, Officers and the Public must assemble at the School Street Car Park. DO NOT re-enter the building until advised to by the Controlling Officer.

### **2. Mobile Phones**

Please switch off all mobile phones before entering the Council Chamber.

### **3. Notice of Motion**

A Notice of Motion other than those listed in Procedure Rule 14 must reach the Chief Executive ten clear days before the relevant Meeting of the Council. Further information on Notices of Motion can be found in Section 5, Standing Order 20 of the Constitution of the Council.

Officers will be in attendance prior to the meeting for informal discussions on agenda items.



## COUNCIL

Wednesday, 24th February, 2021

Time of Commencement: 7.00 pm

**Present:** Mayor - Councillor John Cooper (Chair)

Councillors:	Kenneth Owen	Stephen Sweeney	Barry Panter
	Simon White	Simon Tagg	Ruth Wright
	June Walklate	Silvia Burgess	Gary White
	Ian Wilkes	Mike Stubbs	Jill Waring
	Gillian Williams	Amelia Rout	Andrew Fox-Hewitt
	John Williams	John Tagg	Brian Johnson
	Andrew Fear	Paul Northcott	Annabel Lawley
	Tony Kearon	Bert Proctor	Sue Moffat
	Paul Waring	Sylvia Dymond	Jennifer Cooper
	Mark Holland	Trevor Johnson	Gillian Burnett
	Julie Cooper	Andrew Parker	Helena Maxfield
	Marion Reddish	Sarah Pickup	Graham Hutton
	Kyle Robinson	Mark Olszewski	David Grocott
	Elizabeth Shenton	Dave Jones	
	Gill Heesom	Allison Gardner	

Officers:	David Adams	Executive Director Operational Services
	Geoff Durham	Mayor's Secretary / Member Support Officer
	Martin Hamilton	Chief Executive
	Simon McEneny	Executive Director - Commercial Development & Economic Growth
	Daniel Dickinson	Head of Legal & Governance /Monitoring Officer
	Sarah Wilkes	Head of Finance / S151 Officer
	Aaron Weller	Desktop Services Lead
	Jordan Ibinson	Apprentice - Infrastructure Technician

**Note:** In line with Government directions for the CV-19 pandemic, this meeting was conducted using a hybrid method through video conferencing and attendance in person, whilst observing social distancing - in accordance with the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.

### 1. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

### 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest stated.

**3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

**Resolved:** That the Minutes of the meeting held on 16 December, 2020 be agreed as a correct record, subject to the following amendment being made:

Item 12: Motions of Members: paragraph 6

third line, to be amended to ...'every *report* brought to Council from 2021'...

**4. MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Mayor announced that the Mayoress, Mrs Angela Cooper was poorly and not taking part in any Mayoral duties / virtual engagements etc.

The Leader passed on best wishes, on behalf of the Council, to the Mayoress.

**5. REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGETS AND STRATEGIES 2021/22**

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Simon Tagg introduced the report and moved the recommendations which set out the recommendations of Cabinet for Revenue and Capital Budgets for 2021/22.

Cabinet proposed an increase in council tax for 2021/22 of between £3.89 and £4.44 per year from the 2020/21 amount. This represented an increase of less than ten pence per week for the vast majority of households. Detailed recommendations were set out in Appendix A of the report. Appendix B set out the proposed Revenue Budget for 2021/22. A summary of additional income, additional expenditure and loss of income and new pressures was given in the report.

In summary the Council's updated Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) indicated a forecast budget shortfall of £1.2754m for 2021/22. A summary of savings and funding strategies to bridge the £1.2754m gap had been identified and agreed with managers and these were shown at Appendices C and D.

The Council's S151 Officer had carried out a review of the Council's Balances and Reserves together with a risk assessment. Details were given in Appendix E. The MTFS and budget proposals had been scrutinised by the Finance, Assets and Performance Scrutiny Committee.

The Capital Programme for 2021/22 was given in Appendix F of the report.

The Leader stated that there was optimism that an end was in sight for the pandemic and lockdowns as the number of cases were falling and the number of people receiving the vaccine was increasing. This time last year, there had been an awareness that the pandemic was coming but there had been no understanding of the affect and disruption it would have on people's health and on the livelihoods of residents of the Borough. The Leader paid tribute to the communities, both young and old, doctors, nurses, carers, shop workers and volunteers for their work during this time. The Leader also thanked the Chief Executive all council staff for keeping services going during the pandemic.

The lockdown had meant a significant reduction in the Council's income especially from J2 and car parking charges. There had also been extra expenditure supporting the homeless and also for Covid outbreak control.

Emergency government funding of £3.5m had been forthcoming and had helped the Council to deal with the financial impact and this had allowed a balanced budget position at the end of this current financial year. The Leader thanked local MP's Jonathan Gullis and Aaron Bell for lobbying on the Council's behalf.

The Leader stated that, despite the challenges the proposed budget continued to deliver the priorities set out in the Council Plan. A Recovery Board was convened in the summer involving Cabinet members and heads of service to secure necessary savings this year, totalling £1.275m. The saving had been achieved without affecting front line statutory services. Streetscene was protected and the new recycling service would be further improved over the coming year.

The workforce had continued to evolve and be built up, replacing key staff and a commitment to the recruiting of staff to deliver the Borough Local Plan. The One Council approach would ensure that the Council had the right people in key areas to help deliver local services that work for local people. Money was being put aside to help to build capacity to help to deliver the large government investment coming into the Borough by the Future High Streets Fund of £11.3m and the two Town Deal Funds for Newcastle and Kidsgrove.

Members' attention was drawn to Appendix C which outlined the efficiencies and good housekeeping as part of the budget. The Leader thanked the Council's Finance team and Cabinet members for their work on the savings plans. Members of the Finance, Assets and Performance Scrutiny Committee were also thanked for endorsing the budget's saving proposals on two separate occasions.

The proposals included provision for another boost in the Council's reserves and contingencies from £1.548m to £3m. In addition to the Income reserve of £0.100m

The Leader concluded that this budget was investing in the aspirations for the Borough and its future. The flexible use of the Capital Receipts Policy would be used again this year and a further £250,000 would go into the Borough Growth Fund as outlined in paragraphs 4.7 and 4.8 of the agenda report. This year's Fund would be used to address three challenges that this Council faced:

Recovering from the Covid lockdowns; technological transformation and maintaining sustainable local environment. With the One Council initiative the Council could continue to embed digitalisation. The Leader referred to the Capital Programme as outlined at paragraph 6 of the report.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Efficiency, Councillor Stephen Sweeney seconded the recommendations and thanked officers for their hard work in preparing the budget.

Councillor Sweeney drew Members attention to paragraph 2.1 of the report. Support from Central Government of £3.5m which was expected to be around £5m as there was support coming in for the first quarter of the 2021/22 financial year to help with the effects of the Coronavirus. Reference was made to paragraphs 3 and 4, outlining the savings to meet the shortfall.

The budget helped to make the Borough a better place for local residents. It was a robust, affordable and balanced budget.

Councillor Shenton stated that she would not be supporting the budget. Reference was made to Appendix E which showed the risk assessments for the strategies. Councillor Shenton said that the revenue budget sought to plug the gap with £50,000 from additional income generation although this was seen as high risk. The capital budget was predicted on capital receipts and yet, also not realised as high risk.

Councillor Shenton stated that she could not vote for a Council Tax increase in the current times. In addition, the One Council project appeared to be a strategic change for this Authority with a full review and overhaul to how Council services would be delivered, but there were no details on the plans.

Councillor Stubbs stated that he and his group welcomed the capital investment in Kidsgrove Sports Centre and the money set aside for Walley's Quarry was welcomed by residents across the Borough. It was also important that all key services continued to be fully funded and the Council's work in the community must be protected at all cost. Councillor Stubbs asked the Portfolio Holder why the budget consultation responses had fallen by 80% in one year. Residents were still providing comments but only 89 people from across Newcastle and 4 from outside of Newcastle had replied to the consultation.

Newcastle currently had just under 7,000 people furloughed. A further 3,600 people had received help from the income support scheme and 4,000 claiming out of work benefits. Councillor Stubbs asked if an assessment had been made on the impact of a rise in Council Tax on families. Councillor Stubbs asked if the Portfolio Holder had written to the Chancellor asking him to back local councils with the funding needed to prevent Council Tax rises. In addition, Councillor Stubbs asked the Leader if he could rule out a further Council Tax rise in 2022/23.

Councillor Hutton referred to paragraph 8.3 of the report, welcoming the increase in reserves which would help to preserve the long term resilience of the Council.

Councillor Proctor stated that the budget was a remarkable achievement in view of the awful year that this Borough and country had just endured. It would enable the Council to continue to provide vital services.

Councillor Holland stated that no alternative budget had been submitted by the Labour Group and no amendments had been proposed. Councillor Holland stated that this was an excellent budget and the best that could have been produced in a time of unprecedented difficulties. The Borough Growth Fund was a fantastic mechanism where money could be invested.

Councillor Fox-Hewitt recognised the difficult times that this and all Councils were currently experiencing. There were elements of the budget that he could support, such as the investment in facilities for Kidsgrove and the money set aside for Walley's Quarry. However, Councillor Fox-Hewitt stated that this money would not go far enough given the impact that the landfill appeared to have and it was a large concern for residents across the Borough.

The Town Centre investment was welcomed and the hard work of the Cabinet and officers in the bid preparation was recognised. Councillor Fox-Hewitt stated that he could not support the budget for two reasons - the increase in Council Tax and the lack of investment in Bradwell and Porthill. He asked that the budget be taken away with a fresh approach to the Borough's priorities with cross party contribution and consensus.

Councillor Parker praised the officers and the Cabinet for the speedy and effective distribution of over £29m in government grants to local businesses to help them keep going during the current pandemic.

Councillor Fear stated that his was an excellent budget which had not received any proposed amendments.

Councillor Jones felt that there were elements of the budget that he could support, welcoming the £50,000 investment with regard to investigating the source of the odours in the vicinity of Walley's Quarry. When it came to taxation, this was one of the most difficult decisions that Councillors had to make. However, he understood that the Council Tax rise, leading to £187,000 was minimal when the Council was increasing its reserves from £1.5m to £8.3m. Councillor Jones stated that he could not support the budget when the Council Tax increase could be found from efficiencies elsewhere.

Councillor Paul Waring stated that any increase in taxes was unfortunate but it was essential in order to protect the services going forward.

Councillor John Williams stated that he could not support the budget. Austerity and the pandemic had pushed the spending power of Borough residents to the limit. The Council Tax increase would add to the pressure on families budgets.

Councillors' Olszewski and Gardner also could not agree to an increase in Council Tax.

Councillor Moffat welcomed the Government's Covid recovery fund but wanted to see a budget that was optimistic and uplifting which built on the amazing contribution that local people had given to help overcome this pandemic. More detail was needed on the budget plus reassurance that the money being paid locally would benefit local people and spent locally.

Councillor Northcott stated that this was a 'steady as you go' budget. The highest Council Tax increase would be Band H which would be £10 per year and Band A was £3.33 per year. Services had to be paid and protected and contingency funds had to be there to manage the portfolio of properties that the Council managed It was a safe and well thought out budget.

Councillor Rout was pleased to see the investment for Walley's Quarry but could not agree to an increase in Council Tax, saying that any rise was a rise too far at this current time.

Councillor Maxfield supported the budget stating that it continued to support vulnerable people around the Borough.

Councillor Kearon acknowledged that there were some positive items in the budget, particularly the investment into investigating Walley's Quarry and the odour. However the budget showed no allocation of funding for Environmental Health until 2023/24.

Councillor Trevor Johnson was in support of the budget. Despite Covid, the Council had kept moving forward. The Guildhall was now opened up again at the heart of the community. The Markets had improved and more events around them had come into the town. Kidsgrove Sports Centre refurbishment was progressing and the new recycling system was a success.

Councillor Lawley Could not support the budget due to the Council Tax increase stating that the use of food banks in the area was on the increase and people could not afford it.

The Leader thanked members for the debate. In summing up, he confirmed that the budget had been scrutinised on two occasions by the Finance, Assets and Performance Scrutiny Committee. The odour coming from Walley's Quarry had been receiving complaints during the time of the previous administration but it was only now being acted upon, including meeting with the Environment Agency, whose job it would then be to take action. The One Council approach was discussed at Council last year and it had been to Scrutiny. The online consultation had not received as many responses as last year but if three years were taken in a row you get a view that reflects what people wanted.

The Leader stated that the budget on the table was the best budget for the Council, it had a low Council Tax increase of less than 10p per week for average households and for the services being delivered and the improvements being made. The Leader stated that he was pleased to recommend the budget to Council.

A named vote was then taken in respect of the proposed budget:

<b>BURGESS</b>	N	<b>JONES</b>	N	<b>SHENTON</b>	N
<b>BURNETT</b>	Y	<b>KEARON</b>	N	<b>STUBBS</b>	N
<b>COOPER. Jenny</b>	Y	<b>LAWLEY</b>	N	<b>SWEENEY</b>	Y
<b>COOPER John</b>	Y	<b>MAXFIELD</b>	Y	<b>TAGG J</b>	Y
<b>COOPER Julie</b>	Y	<b>MOFFAT</b>	N	<b>TAGG S</b>	Y
<b>DYMOND</b>	N	<b>NORTHCOTT</b>	Y	<b>WALKLATE</b>	Y
<b>FEAR</b>	Y	<b>OLSZEWSKI</b>	N	<b>WARING J</b>	Y
<b>FOX-HEWITT</b>	N	<b>OWEN</b>	Y	<b>WARING P</b>	Y
<b>GARDNER</b>	N	<b>PANTER</b>	Y	<b>WHITE G</b>	Y
<b>GROCOTT</b>	N	<b>PARKER</b>	Y	<b>WHITE S</b>	Y
<b>HEESOM</b>	Y	<b>PICKUP</b>	N	<b>WILKES</b>	Y
<b>HOLLAND</b>	Y	<b>PROCTOR</b>	Y	<b>WILLIAMS G</b>	N
<b>HUTTON</b>	Y	<b>REDDISH</b>	Y	<b>WILLIAMS J</b>	N
<b>JOHNSON B</b>	N	<b>ROBINSON</b>	N	<b>WRIGHT</b>	N
<b>JOHNSON T</b>	Y	<b>ROUT</b>	N		

In Favour (Y)- 25

Against (N)- 19

Abstain – 0

**Resolved:** That recommendations a to o, as set out in Appendix 'A' of the agenda report be approved.

**6. PUBLICATION OF A PAY POLICY STATEMENT FOR 2021/22**

The Leader introduced a report seeking Council's approval of the Pay Policy Statement for 2021/22.

This was an annual requirement of the Localism Act, 2011 setting out the remuneration of chief officers and the lowest paid employees and the changes in roles and titles of senior officers.

**Resolved:** That the Pay Policy Statement, as attached at Appendix A to the report, be approved.

**7. QUESTIONS TO THE MAYOR, CABINET MEMBERS AND COMMITTEE CHAIRS**

Councillor Stubbs asked the Leader for an update on the resolution made at the Council meeting held in December regarding Sustainable Development Goals.

The Leader stated that a report was being prepared which addressed the Motion, setting out how it would be progressed. It was a standing agenda item on the Sustainable Environment Steering Group. The report would include the mapping for which of the sustainable goals and targets were most relevant to the Council. The work would require resourcing from the policy perspective and the One Council programme would see the formation of a corporate policy capacity at the centre of the organisation which would take on that work and be updated as it moved forward.

Councillor Stubbs stated that there had been a request at the previous meeting that all reports coming to Full Council be marked appropriately, according to the sustainable development goals but the two reports at this meeting did not have those markings. Could it be ensured that the reports at the next meeting would have the markings as requested and passed by the Motion.

The Leader assured that this would happen and stated that, although the reports at this meeting did not have the mark on them, the first report definitely had an indication to the sustainable goals. The Borough Growth Fund showed £100,000 for environmental sustainability, £50,000 for the unpleasant odour, £70,000 for town centre recovery, £100,000 for the One Council programme. The Capital Programme had solar panels, subways improvement, pest control vehicles and electric charging points which were all part of this.

Councillor Fear asked the Leader for an outline of the threats posed by a Clean Air Zone (CAZ) for residents and businesses in the Borough.

The Leader stated that the CAZ's were essentially where the most polluted vehicles of certain type and age paid a daily charge to enter a particular geographical area. CAZ's had two potential impacts. It could mean a significant economic blow for the area. The CAZ assumes a daily charge on older vehicles ranging from £5 for a car, £9 for LGV's and up to £35 for HGV's. A report showed that the fleet of private vehicles in both Newcastle and Stoke on Trent were relatively old and around 20% of them would be non-compliant vehicles. This figure was above the national average. Imposing those charges would impact upon those least able to pay such daily charges. In addition, A CAZ would need a larger area to cover it rather than the bus gate. Displacement of the vehicles avoiding the CAZ would lead to exceedencies elsewhere.

Councillor Fear stated that this was very concerning and asked the Leader for assurance that he would continue to campaign and lobby against the imposition of a CAZ in the Borough.

The Leader confirmed this stating that he would be writing to the local MP's and the Leader of Stoke on Trent City Council outlining the concerns and hoped that he had the support of Council in doing so.

Councillor Fox-Hewitt asked the Leader to advise what robust processes were in place to ensure that Council policies around ethical tendering were adhered to when contacting services on behalf of the Council.

The Leader stated that there was cross-party support for the procurement measures referred to and contracting processes which were designed to ensure, as far as possible, that a full range of ethical considerations were required of its suppliers. As part of the contract management process, officers were doing their best to test a sample of contracts for compliance but it was not always possible to check compliance on every term of every contract that the Council had let. If any instances were discovered where the Council's agreed procurement of contract requirements were not met, the situation would be considered carefully and appropriate action would be taken.

Councillor Fox-Hewitt asked the Leader if he was aware of any complaints or challenges that Council was not adhering to the extant policies of the Council.

The Leader stated that there was something that Councillor Fox-Hewitt and other Members were involved in but it should not be discussed at a Council meeting. There was a meeting on this tomorrow where it would be looked into as part of a disciplinary hearing.

Councillor Paul Waring asked the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Efficiency to list any capital projects between 2012 and 2017 which specifically focussed on Kidsgrove.

Councillor Sweeney stated that the only capital project that he had found specifically for Kildsgrove was in 2016-17 when £15,000 was given for the ski centre.

Councillor Paul Waring asked for assurance that the people of Kildsgrove were now getting a fair share of the capital expenditure of the Borough Council.

Councillor Sweeney confirmed that this was the case.

Councillor Stubbs asked the Leader for an update on the progress being made for the May elections in terms of the nomination process, staffing and setting up of polling stations. In addition, Councillor Stubbs asked for an update on the number of volunteers who had confirmed their availability and for confirmation that there would be no reduction in the number of polling stations.

The Leader advised that a briefing note had been circulated to Members this evening. Informal Cabinet had previously had a briefing on this as had group leaders. Measures were in place to deal with the effect of Covid. The elections would be completely different this year for a lot of people, there would also be more postal votes and the Council needed to ensure that there would be extra capacity on the telephones as a lot more of the Council's business was being done over the phone or on the internet so it was important to have more capacity as more people would want postal votes and there would be more queries regarding voting this time.

Councillor Stubbs asked if postal vote applications could be sent out with every Council Tax bill.

The Leader stated that the availability of postal votes was being promoted and it would also be up to the political parties to promote them.

Councillor Moffat asked the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Recycling what plans there were to progress the resolution, passed in April, 2019 to aim to make Newcastle a carbon neutral Borough by 2030.

Councillor Trevor Johnson stated that at the Cabinet meeting last December, a report was considered on the Sustainable Environment Strategy and Action Plan for the Council and Borough. At that meeting, Councillor Johnson had referred to the 2019 resolution declaring a climate emergency and the commitment of Cabinet to deliver a Sustainable Environment Strategy. The Leader had reported how the work would be ongoing and would include partners - Keele University and Staffordshire County Council. The work to progress the Carbon Capture agenda, especially in urban areas had been particularly highlighted. Cabinet had endorsed the work to tackle environmental issues and agreed to seek views and support for the Strategy and Action Plan from key local partners and the Economy, Environment and Place Scrutiny Committee would be reviewing this at their meeting in March.

Councillor Moffat asked that it be considered to take a citizens assembly approach in order to co-design or form a smart strategy to achieve a low or zero carbon future for Newcastle.

Councillor Trevor Johnson took this on board and agreed to contact Councillor Moffat after the meeting to discuss this further.

**8. DISCLOSURE OF EXEMPT INFORMATION**

There were no confidential items for consideration.

**9. STANDING ORDER 18 - URGENT BUSINESS**

There was no urgent business.

**COUNCILLOR JOHN COOPER**  
**Chair**

Meeting concluded at 8.50 pm

## COUNCIL

Thursday, 18th March, 2021  
Time of Commencement: 7.00 pm

**Present:** Mayor - Councillor John Cooper (Chair)

Councillors:	Kenneth Owen	Stephen Sweeney	Allison Gardner
	Simon White	Simon Tagg	Barry Panter
	June Walklate	Silvia Burgess	Ruth Wright
	Ian Wilkes	Mike Stubbs	Gary White
	Gillian Williams	Amelia Rout	Jill Waring
	John Williams	John Tagg	Andrew Fox-Hewitt
	Andrew Fear	Paul Northcott	Brian Johnson
	Tony Kearon	Bert Proctor	Annabel Lawley
	Paul Waring	Sylvia Dymond	Sue Moffat
	Mark Holland	Trevor Johnson	Jennifer Cooper
	Julie Cooper	Andrew Parker	Gillian Burnett
	Marion Reddish	Sarah Pickup	Helena Maxfield
	Kyle Robinson	Mark Olszewski	Graham Hutton
	Gill Heesom	Dave Jones	David Grocott

Officers:	David Adams	Executive Director Operational Services
	Geoff Durham	Mayor's Secretary / Member Support Officer
	Martin Hamilton	Chief Executive
	Simon McEneny	Executive Director - Commercial Development & Economic Growth
	Daniel Dickinson	Head of Legal & Governance /Monitoring Officer
	Nesta Barker	Head of Environmental Health Services
	Aaron Weller	Desktop Services Lead

**Note:** In line with Government directions for the CV-19 pandemic, this meeting was conducted using a hybrid method through video conferencing and attendance in person, whilst observing social distancing - in accordance with the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillor Shenton.

2. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest stated.

3. **REPORT OF THE ECONOMY, ENVIRONMENT AND PLACE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE INTO CONCERNS ABOUT WALLEY'S QUARRY LANDFILL**

Consideration was given to a report of the Economy Environment and Place Scrutiny Committee regarding a review that had been undertaken in respect of Walley's Quarry.

The Chair of the Scrutiny Review Working Party - Walley's Quarry, Councillor Andrew Fear introduced the report and moved the recommendations. Councillor Fear stated that it had been a long process due to the emergence of Covid-19 which had slowed the work down. Councillor Fear thanked the officers from the Council's Environmental Health team for their work and also, officers in the IT department who had enabled meetings to continue throughout the pandemic.

Members' attention was drawn to pages 61 to 63 of the supplementary agenda which listed a series of recommendations for the Environment Agency (EA); the Borough Council; RED; MP's; Staffordshire County Council; the Liaison Committee and the Police. It was hoped that the recommendations to the organisations would not just be read but acted upon. Councillor Fear stated that the recommendations were sensible and achievable.

Councillor Gary White seconded the recommendations and endorsed the contents of the report. Councillor White thanked Councillor Fear for chairing the Working Party and also, all of the Members who took part in it.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Simon Tagg thanked the hundreds of local residents and the large number of Councillors who had called for this Extraordinary Meeting. The meeting was an opportunity to debate the longstanding and ongoing problems with odour and other issues associated with the Walley's Quarry Landfill. Also, the failure of the Environment Agency, as the regulator to take appropriate action – until in the last week or so, following an avalanche of complaints. Two thousand complaints had been received over the weekend of 26-28 February, 2021.

The odours had caused concern and were still causing distress to many residents across the Borough. Complaints had been raised and amplified by Borough Councillors and local MP, Aaron Bell who took the matter to the Prime Minister. The pressure had led to the recent announcement by the EA which confirmed that there had, and continued to be a significant breach of the permit by the operator – RED Industries.

A Motion would be put forward later in the meeting which would call for the continued suspension of operations but also supported calls from residents for the landfill to be permanently closed and for the restoration of the site to greenspace.

The Leader thanked the campaigners who had mobilised over a long period via the Stop the Stink Facebook page and had continued to pursue it until those in authority at the EA had finally started to act. The Leader also thanked all of the Councillors and officers who took part in the review. The Leader was pleased to receive the report and endorsed the list of recommendations, particularly those for the EA - namely, to suspend the operators permit and prohibit the importation of waste materials whilst the odours were mitigated. Also, the call for RED Industries to go beyond their statutory minimum requirement to tackle the odour issues in their landfill.

The Leader urged everyone to read the previous reports on this matter and to watch the meetings on YouTube, which contained full details of the history of Walley's Quarry dating back to the permission for the landfill in 1998 which had been granted by the then Secretary of State. Early in 2019, the EA gave a temporary permission as the operator was on course to breach their permit, relating to the tonnage of materials going into the landfill. The Leader had asked the EA to clarify this. The EA gave permission for the significant increase of tonnage allowed via the permit despite the objections of this Council and local residents/groups. The Leader's view was that this had contributed to the current problems on the site and the dates fitted with the increase of foul odour complaints experienced from New Year 2019 onwards, leading to the significant breach and the two minor breaches relating to Walley's Quarry Landfill that had been reported by the EA in recent weeks. The Leader contended that the Council had seen bad regulation by the EA, coupled with poor management by the operator all of which had resulted in the odours now faced.

The scrutiny report provided evidence and a timeline for a worsening situation to the landfill and a series of recommendations that, it was hoped would be heeded by those concerned.

Councillor Jones stated that the odour issues had plagued his entire time that he had lived in Newcastle since 2010, although then they were not in the intensity or frequency that had been seen over the last two years. It was important to recognise the hard work that the Members had put into the report which contained very fair, clear and open recommendations. The Council had spent a considerable amount of time getting to where the root of the problem was and it was hoped that the recommendations would be acted upon.

Councillor Holland stated that the odours had made people feel ill and had robbed them of their enjoyment of outdoor exercise, blighted the streets and entered into people's homes. The odour was evident in the Westlands and in the past month, at night it had been present more often than it had not. From the number and pattern of complaints it was clear that the issue had become rapidly worse across the Borough. When the scrutiny work was commissioned in 2019 it was only communities in Silverdale and Poolfields that were reporting foul odour. The report bore out the direction of travel and the worsening of the problem. Reference was made to the chart at paragraph 5.26 which showed a huge increase in complaints to the Council from August 2020, which related to Walley's Quarry. DEFRA had confirmed recently that a six month rolling total for complaints relating to Walley's Quarry had hit 6,938. One of the issues that the report had to deal with was the difficulty in qualifying and quantifying the nature of odour nuisance. Paragraph 5.25 set out the measurement metrics and paragraph 4.25 confirmed the Council's Environmental Health Department's investigating and determining statutory nuisance measurement of odour had been detected. There had to be a case for more detailed analysis of the kind of waste being tipped at the quarry and some reckoning made of the kind of waste that was known to generate odorous chemicals upon decomposition. Also, was the additional volume, accepted by the permit variation last year, preventing odour management? It was known that complaints had spiked since the permit variation. Were new types of waste being tipped which produced odorous chemicals? For example, plasterboard contained sulphates which would react with landfill conditions to produce hydrogen sulphide. What other factors were there to explain why the EA had now reported three breaches of the site permit in recent days? Councillor Holland stated that he was disappointed with the engagement of the site operator, as detailed in the report from paragraph 2.9 onwards, with the scrutiny review. They had cast aspersions on the Council's motivation in preparing the report and questioned the Council's right to investigate and represent the

residents. Councillor Holland endorsed the recommendations and encouraged the site operator to consider the actions set out at 8.3 of the report.

Councillor Gardner stated that trying to ascertain a causative link between health issues and odours associated with landfill sites had been difficult to research. However, the Lancet had published a study in June, 2020 that had showed a significant association with asthma and other health issues such as depression. A study in 2015 by the International Journal of Epidemiology showed a strong association with respiratory diseases and hydrogen sulphide odours associated with landfill sites. The Royal Stoke Hospital itself had complained about the odours. Given that diseases such as COPD and asthma were significant health concerns for borough wards adjacent to the landfill site and also wards further away, did the Council have any plans to gather health data including mental health, epidemiological and risk perception studies which could help to support or allay residents health concerns? Even if links were not proven it still would not negate the impact on quality of life that residents had been and still were experiencing.

Councillor Fox Hewitt thanked everyone involved in producing the report. Also, the hundreds of residents and campaign groups such as Stop the Stink. Councillor Fox-Hewitt asked if a sample drilling core could be taken and subjected to testing from the site. In addition, could the case study of the issues experienced to date, including this report be sent to the Planning Inspectorate and the Minister for Housing, Communities and Local Government. Councillor Fox-Hewitt felt that the regulatory and legislative framework had let residents down in terms of protection and this included residents in the Bradwell ward. He felt that the adversarial approach taken by RED Industries, repeatedly questioning the Council's impartiality, a general reluctance to engage in due process and the number of complaints made about the Council's attempt in engaging and ensuring scrutiny was to be taken in a dim light. In light of the behaviour, along with the negative impact that had blighted residents lives across the Borough, Councillor Fox-Hewitt fully supported the strongest possible response by the Council and the EA including but not limited to regulatory enforcement sanctions and exploring the termination of the licence.

Councillor Julie Cooper stated that the town was receiving bad press due to the odour and, at a time when the town needed to be recovering post-covid, including the markets, the recommendations within the report needed to be acted upon.

Councillor Wright stated that in the last six weeks she had been inundated with complaints. The odour had also travelled outside of the Borough. Councillor Proctor echoed all comments, stating that Audley was also affected, over five miles away. There was little doubt that people's health was being affected by this.

Councillor Brian Johnson stated that the first question raised about Walley's Quarry was in 2019 when many residents were concerned about the odours and associated conditions around the site. The first public meeting had been held at Knutton Residents Association. Councillor Johnson thanked Angela Eagles, Graham Eagles and Tony Eagles and Stephen Meakin for raising this as an issue. The issue was not just about the odour but also, traffic, vermin, flooding.

Councillor Parker stated that he lived two miles away and could smell it in his own home as could residents within his Clayton Ward.

Councillor Reddish stated that she was probably the Councillor who lived closest to the Quarry and the odour had become increasingly worse over the past ten years.

Issues regarding the highways also needed addressing, not just traffic but also the dirty state of the roads and the litter on the side of the roads coming from the site.

Councillor Robinson stated that he never thought that it would affect his residents in Talke but the odour was reaching there too. He stated that he did not understand how, with all of the regulations in place that were supposed to protect people that this issue had gone on for so long. The EA had been far too slow to react and it felt like a dereliction of duty. The best outcome would be for the site to be shut down. It was also a worry to hear people saying that their health had been adversely affected and hoped that more work would be done to investigate that.

Councillor Olszewski had been receiving complaints from residents in Wolstanton. The EA's mission statement was to 'protect and enhance the environment'. In this particular case, he felt that there had been failure by the EA, certainly to protect the environment and those affected by the odours associated with the quarry.

Councillor Sweeney stated that at 11pm last night the odour was extremely strong in Clayton and over the last year had become increasingly worse and since Christmas, the intensity had gotten worse. Councillor Sweeney queried what was being tipped to produce that smell? In a report, toluene had been mentioned which was used to make TNT. The site needed to be closed and sealed/capped to get rid of the odour. The Council was looking at the reopening of the town centre after lockdown but the town centre also stank. People would not spend time in such conditions.

Councillor Moffat stated that it was awful that it had reached the stage where a father had felt the need to take drastic actions which had landed him in trouble. It needed to go further, people had been made to feel that their own noses were not as good as machines that had not even been plugged in, to test the level of smell. There needed to be an enquiry into the handling of the situation. People were also concerned about the water that had been used to wash down lorries running into waterways.

Councillor Gary White was concerned about the impact that this had had on the community and the Borough. The Madeley ward had also been receiving complaints and since Christmas had really exacerbated. The impact on Newcastle town Centre was also of concern. The Council had recently been awarded funding for the regeneration of the town centre. Councillor White queried how people could be encouraged to come into the town with the foul odours which were evident. It would affect businesses, the footfall and have a major impact. The EA had got to be held to account for this.

Councillor Lawley stated that people in the borough and further afield had been affected and said that RED Industries had been completely inconsiderate of anyone living nearby and the EA had been negligible and needed to be held to account. Councillor Lawley stated that the pressure needed to be kept up to ensure a satisfactory outcome.

Councillor Panter stated that mention had been made in the Sentinel that there were plans to reopen the West Coast Main Line from Madeley to Newcastle. He felt that this would be unrealistic until action could be enforced on this matter. Also, Councillor Panter questioned where the rubbish actually came from and where it would go to now that the Walley's Quarry site had temporarily ceased taking in rubbish.

Councillor John Williams stated that a lot of traffic headed through his ward to get to the site. The odour had also been appalling. The EA had let the Borough down.

They were consultants on every planning application that came into the Council and their expertise was relied upon to protect the residents which they had not done. On recent planning applications, including the Hamptons site, the EA's report was taken on board by the Planning Inspectorate and planning permission was granted for a site right next door to the landfill site. Further, a lot of Borough residents suffered from respiratory diseases through working in heavy industry in the past – such as foundries and the coal mines. How were these people supposed to cope with the odour when trying to breath in fresh air.

Councillor Kearon stated that the report was a good start but it was important to keep building up on it and keep up the pressure. Residents not being able to sleep with their windows open, feeling sick and suffering headaches was not acceptable. Across the Borough, people were starting to experience what the residents of Silverdale, Knutton and Thistleberry had been experiencing for years. What did the evidence say about the impact that this was having on residents – the depressing thing was that this was not known. There was not enough evidence of what happened with long term exposure to what the EA might refer to as 'low levels' of hydrogen sulphide and all of the other gases coming from the site. It was clear that there was a significant mental health impact with this - but again, there was not enough evidence. A scientist who specialised in what happened to various gases when released into the atmosphere had showed Councillor Kearon a report which he would be happy to share with Members and residents. When hydrogen sulphide was released into the atmosphere on a warm sunny day it would dissipate in approximately one hour, however, in the winter it could linger for up to 42 days.

Councillor Paul Waring sympathised with anyone who was selling their house in the vicinity of the Quarry. Whether they wanted to or needed to, it would be very difficult to sell a property in those conditions.

Councillor Pickup spoke on behalf of her son's friend who lived on the new estate by the Morrisons store at the Milehouse. He said he was seriously worried about what it was doing to his 18 month old son and his pregnant partner. All three of them had asthma. The smell got into their home overnight and they all had sore eyes, sore throats and headaches every morning. He pleaded for the site to be shut down.

Councillor Fear summed up stating that he was pleased that Members supported the report and hoped that residents were heartened with the attitude of the Council towards it. He urged people to read the reports and to watch past meetings on YouTube.

The Leader stated that it had been an excellent debate and a lot of comments had been echoed through the social media feed. This was a widespread issue affecting many people. On the health issues, people with concerns must go to their GP to enable the gathering of data. The issue had escalated since Christmas and this was most likely related to the amount of materials going in which had overwhelmed the operator and the result of that was now being seen with the breaches. Reference was made to planning permissions that had been given for houses to be built within 'sniffing' distance of the site. The Leader assured residents that the Council's Planning Committee refused those applications but were overturned by the Planning Inspectorate. He agreed with comments made about house sales and also the affect that it would have on the town centre at a time when good things were happening. Unfortunately, the Council did not have the regulatory power to close the site. The Council could investigate nuisance and odour but it was the EA who had the direct power as the permit regulator to do that. The focus of the Council was on getting the EA to act and to take responsibility.

All Members were in support of the report and thanked everyone involved including officers, residents, the Leader of the Council, the Scrutiny Working Part, Members, community/residents/pressure groups and the local MP – Aaron Bell.

- Resolved:**
- (i) That the report of the Economy, Environment and Place Scrutiny Committee be received.
  - (ii) That the recommendations of the Walley's Quarry Landfill Site Scrutiny Review be endorsed.

**4. REPORT ON ODOUR INCIDENT 26 TO 28 FEBRUARY AND THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY'S RESPONSE**

Consideration was given to a report advising Members of an environmental incident over the weekend of 26 to 28 February, 2021.

The Leader introduced the report and moved the recommendation to receive it. Although the report covered that particular weekend, the Leader felt that the incident was still ongoing. There had been many complaints earlier today to the Council's online reporting system. There had been a huge number of complaints over the reported weekend and maps contained within the report showed the distribution of those complaints. It was believed that the EA had no one going out and monitoring the odours that weekend even though there had been numerous reports on Friday 26 February.

The Leader proposed to amend the recommendation of the report to write to the Prime Minister asking for an independent investigation to be carried out into the way that the EA had operated and reacted to the strong foul odours that weekend and since.

Councillor Sweeney seconded the recommendations, including the additional one proposed by the Leader. That weekend had been the culmination of the inefficiency of the EA. The EA had begun to take action in the past week or so and the more pressure that could be put onto them by the Prime Minister the better.

Councillor Jones endorsed everything that had been said including the recommendation for an independent investigation. The distances that the odours were travelling was having a widespread impact on residents especially during the current pandemic. People were unable to go outside to enjoy the fresh air because of the foul odours. The report showed a number of abject failures by the regulator including ensuring that power was going to the monitoring equipment and failure to substantiate the odour complaint. In addition there was a number of breaches. If the Council was to have trust in the regulator there also had to be faith that they were doing their job properly. Councillor Jones referred to external submissions to the Council, declaring an interest that he was currently employed by the vet school at Keele University.

The Vice Chancellor of the University had stated that the odours were impacting on their ability to operate and therefore impinging on economic regeneration. Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Service stated how the odours triggered a health and safety concern for fire operatives. The BID stated how businesses were being affected within the town centre and a submission by Aaron Bell MP which mentioned the number of complaints received by his office over that weekend. There were submissions from local primary schools. Councillor Jones read out a letter from a

pupil from St Luke's School in Silverdale who stated how the landfill was affecting people's health and stopping children from going out to play.

Councillor Holland stated that the report highlighted how important it was to have a regulator who was capable of reacting quickly to complaints. Reference was made to the monitoring equipment that had not been plugged in at, what transpired to be, the critical moment. The regulator had conceded a breach in the permit conditions relating to the connection of gas wells and in a recent publication, the EA stated that a breach of that nature was capable of being associated with foul odours. However it would have been better to have had an assessment done in person, at the appropriate time. Councillor Holland asked whether the Leader believed that the regulator would now work more efficiently to deal with the ongoing incident and what additional pressure could be brought by the Council which would hold the regulator to account. Tribute was paid to the work of Aaron Bell MP who had a Private Member's Bill coming down the line and who had been engaged with the EA and site operator before his election in 2019. Councillor Holland asked the Leader if he could confirm and reassure Members that he had been in touch with the County Council to ensure that they were doing what they could to defend the condition of the roads.

Councillor Fear stated that evidence would be dismissed as heresy as there was no data. The report included press releases from the EA and reference to the fact that they were installing monitoring equipment on Wednesday 24 February, 2021. The press releases also gave assurances that the machine would continually collect data. A report from the EA following that weekend stated that there had been a problem with the electricity supply and said that they understood that this could be frustrating. Councillor Fear stated that he would like to see the Council's Chief Executive write to the EA asking for a full explanation of why the machine was not connected upon installation and who was responsible for the non-connection. In addition, the residents of the Borough deserved an apology from the EA.

Councillor Brian Johnson stated that this was a matter of public trust in the EA and residents needed to be confident that, when experiencing issues, that they were reporting them to an agency who would take complaints seriously and care about what was being said.

Councillor Rout talked about residents' mental health in what had been possibly the most difficult year in a lot of people's lives. The opportunity to go outdoors for exercise and fresh air had been taken away from people. The EA needed to act quickly because they were responsible for people's ability to maintain mental health and wellbeing. Councillor Rout thanked the community for rallying round.

Councillor Julie Cooper hoped that someone from the EA would visit in person instead of relying on equipment that could go wrong or not be plugged in. That person should spend a week in that area to experience the odours for themselves.

Councillor Proctor referred to public confidence in the EA. He questioned whether the EA was fit for purpose and had serious concerns about the overall efficiency and capability of the EA in its current form.

The Leader thanked everyone for their comments. The Leader stated that he had been in meetings when the EA had been dismissive of people commenting on the odour and had blamed the odours on burning tyres or the sewers but never the quarry although this had changed in recent days.

RED industries had maintained that they had a permit compliant site but this had proved otherwise in recent days.

- Resolved:**
- (i) That the report be received.
  - (ii) That a letter be sent to the Prime Minister, from the Leader of the Council, asking for an independent investigation to be undertaken into the way that the EA had operated and reacted to the odours coming from the Walley's Quarry Landfill.

## **5. MOTIONS OF MEMBERS**

A Motion had been submitted to Council moved by Councillor Jones and seconded by Councillor Simon Tagg. The Motion demanded the immediate suspension of operations and acceptance of waste at Walley's Quarry Landfill.

Councillor Jones spoke on the Motion stating that he was furious that this had got to the point where the Council had to step in and demand that bodies such as the EA and Public Health England (PHE) step up and do their jobs properly – to protect the health and environment for residents of the Borough.

The Motion empowered the Chief Executive to demand that the EA and PHE take the actions required to put an end to the misery and potential health implications of the odours. The Motion demanded that the EA suspend the permit at the site until such time that the source of the odours was identified and resolved and should that require early capping off, that the EA took such action with the operator.

The Council had been told repeatedly by PHE that there was no evidence to suggest that the odours had any effect on health. However, residents had reported that the odours had made them vomit, triggered asthma attacks and struggled with breathing so it was evident that health was being affected. The Council had asked PHE repeatedly to investigate the complaints and they had refused. They had worked only on data compiled from GP records and residents had struggled to get their GP to recognise the potential health implications. Dr Scott at Silverdale Surgery was commended for taking this on board, enabling residents to lodge their health complaints, in writing so that it is recorded.

The Motion also demanded that PHE make health screening available to all residents to ensure that the odours did not have a detrimental effect on people's health. They needed to come here and assess this as it could no longer be a data driven computer based project.

The odours associated with the site were not a recent problem, dating back many years but it did not reflect the intensity that people had been forced to endure over recent years. Over the years, there had been a change in operator on the site and a rapid increase in the volume and frequency of waste being deposited there. In 2018/19 the EA granted the operator a temporary increase in the volume of waste permitted. Councillors had raised formal objections as had Silverdale Parish Council and the Borough Council. In 2020 the EA granted a permanent increase in the volume of waste from 250,000 to 400,000 tonnes despite all of the formal objections raised.

The events of the past few weeks showed how a history of misregulation had resulted in the current situation. The EA reported a breach in the permit by the operator only to change it to a minor breach. During the last week the EA had issued notice of a number of significant breaches of the permit in relation to the connection

of gas wells and previously in the management of leachate of the site. The EA, rather than suspend the permit, enabled the operator to temporarily cease operations. That was not taking control of the situation but passing the buck. It was clear that the operator was failing to act within the parameters of the permit and the EA were failing to enforce the permit properly.

The Motion called upon the Secretary of State to undertake an independent investigation.

Against the adversity of the odour, residents had remained steadfast in their resolve, constantly logging complaints with the EA and Council and all deserved recognition for doing the area proud. Nath Wint was commended for ensuring that residents' voices were coordinated and heard.

The Leader seconded the Motion and stated that he had received a representation from Newcastle College that afternoon. The college was now open to students post lockdown and was doing its utmost to keep them safe which included the building being well ventilated at all times in line with Government guidance. However, providing such ventilation resulted in the awful permeation of the whole building with the smell.

The Leader again paid tribute to the community and those people named from 'Stop the Stink' deserved credit and regular contact was kept with Steve Meakin and Graham Eagles as well as other members active on Twitter. It started as a community movement, had gone through the Council and right up to number 10 Downing Street and the highest areas of Government. The Motion deserved support for the points put forward and the Council would be acting upon the report and also the resolution of the previous report to ensure that fight for the residents continued until the EA had to look at the future of the site which, it was believed, should be closed and restored to its original state as greenspace.

Councillor Gardner thanked officers for their work on the report discussed previously and also Councillors' Jones and Brian Johnson whose wards had been most affected. Since 2019, when the EA had allowed changes to the licence, problems had escalated significantly and she sympathised with the increased frustrations of residents. Attention was drawn to the resolution requesting the Chief Executive to write to PHE and the North Staffs CCG requesting regular health screening to help monitor the impact. Section 5.93 of the previous report detailed PHE's response which stated that they had not been presented with any environmental data relating to pollutant levels post February, 2018. Neither had they received any analysis regarding the site relating to odour complaints. PHE stated that they had assessed environmental data provided by the EA from July 2017 to 2018 noting that the levels then were low and would not expect there to be any long term health consequences.

Conditions had drastically worsened since 2018 due to the change in the licence awarded by the EA in 2019 and PHE had no data from them. The lack of data was not only concerning but also disrespectful to the residents and the Council. Residents and GP practices were urged to lodge all complaints and health concerns which was needed to make the EA sit up and take notice.

Councillor Holland stated that residents were asking the Council to do everything within its power which it was doing, as was the County Council with regard to the highways. The EA had, tonight published a briefing to local stakeholders which stated '*while we understand residents want the issue to be resolved, we do not believe that closing the site would achieve this*'. Councillor Holland stated that this

was not good enough. The EA had a responsibility and must be held to account. The Motion not only sought to take the matter to the top but also, showed the Council speaking as one to endorse local residents who were asking for the site to be capped off. Councillor Holland concluded by saying companies dealing in waste management were providing a local service but with every site came strict responsibilities. Costs associated with meeting obligations were part of the normal cost of doing business. If the costs of responding to regulatory involvement, the cost of gas wells, chemical treatments and costs associated with capping temporarily bits of landfill that weren't actively being filled exceeded profit, was it not time to walk away and cap it off.

Councillor Fox-Hewitt stated that the residents would want all Councillors in a position of influence to deliver on this issue. Therefore, a proposal was made that a timeline be proposed following the meeting and made public, detailing what the Council would be doing, arising from the Scrutiny report, the investigation and the Motion. The timeline should detail what the Council expected to be done in response to its actions and by when it was expected that the actions be completed.

Councillor Northcott stated that this was not the only occasion where the Council had reason to question whether the EA were doing their job in terms of protecting residents when planning applications had been received. Having to resort to these levels to get the EA to listen was disgraceful.

Councillor Kearon stated that these agencies were supposed to be protecting and supporting the public but were consistently dismissing the severity of what was happening. Residents' quality of life had been completely trashed by the smell. It was important that this was the beginning of the journey and the pressure needed to be kept up, holding everyone to account that needed to be.

Councillor Trevor Johnson stated that he suffered from anosmia meaning that he had had no sense of smell for twenty years and this made it difficult to empathise. However, the distress on his sons face when they had driven past the site was clearly evident.

Councillor Stubbs stated that he had been sent a video of a domestic electric filter in a normal household. The pollution level was normal at first but then at a toxic level, warning the resident to leave the area when a set of patio doors had been opened. It was essential that community leaders such as Steve Meakin and Graham Eagles were not only thanked but actively supported in their ongoing battle to protect the communities. Earlier in the month RED Industries proposed a temporary curtailing of their activities but were the residents of Newcastle expected to believe that in the same period of time that the EA served the company with three breaches of their licence and footage emerged of them operating both before and after the agreed hours of operation. The ineptitude of the national regulator with regard to the quarry was staggering. There was a failure at the EA to ever openly challenge RED Industries which suggested that they were more afraid of the alleged polluter than the potential victims themselves. Councillor Stubbs asked RED and the regulator to work with the Council or there would be no alternative than to go further than the Motion and explore legal avenues on behalf of the residents.

Councillor John Williams referred to the height of the rubbish pile at the site. It needed to be capped off with a watching brief to ensure that it was done correctly.

Councillor Sweeney referred to the Motions request to close the site and capping off. This needed to be done and done correctly.

Councillor Fear referred to the EA's press release which had been brought up earlier by Councillor Holland. The press release also stated that '*it is however untrue to say that the EA had failed to take the concerns of local people seriously*'. The statement also showed that they had already decided, without listening to the debate, that closing the site was not an option at all.

There was a lack of confidence in the EA from residents in the Borough. The EA was not fit for purpose. There had been a 'song and dance' about data collection but then had not delivered which was their job. It was disheartening to see the press release issued without the courtesy of waiting until the end of the debate. Aaron Bell MP was urged to lobby Parliament for serious and substantive reform of the EA.

Councillor Hutton referred to Councillor Holland's reference to money and stated that a class action lawsuit from the people affected could bring the matter to a close.

In summing up, Councillor Jones stated that he was heartened by Councillors comments this evening. Picking up on Councillor Gardeners comment on health, Covid 19 was one of the worst respiratory diseases that the world had ever faced and the issue being discussed this evening affected people's respiratory health. That was why PHE needed to come and investigate this. Councillor Jones endorsed all of the comments made including the capping off properly of the site. The EA had already decided that they were not going to listen to the Council, releasing a press release even before a vote had been taken on the Motion. The timeline mentioned by Councillor Fox-Hewitt was also endorsed in order to keep residents informed as to what was happening. The ultimate was legal action which the Council should be considering.

The Leader thanked Members for the debate. The County Council had been approached regarding the mud on the road and it had led to a notice of action that would be taken. Dr Scott had advised that residents had reported worsening asthma, hayfever type symptoms, nausea, insomnia and depression. These were very concerning and needed to be listened to.

The Leader would ensure that this was taken forward and keep people informed through social media and the Council's web page. The message to residents was that the Council was listening to them and their voices would be taken forward to the higher levels and will be holding the EA to account.

**Resolved:** That the Motion be carried.

6. **URGENT BUSINESS**

There was no urgent business.

7. **DISCLOSURE OF EXEMPT INFORMATION**

No confidential items were discussed.

**COUNCILLOR JOHN COOPER**  
Chair

Meeting concluded at 9.25 pm



## NEWCASTLE-UNDER-LYME BOROUGH COUNCIL

### EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT TEAM'S REPORT TO

Council  
19 May 2021

**Report Title:** Appointment to Committees

**Submitted by:** Chief Executive

**Portfolios:** Corporate and Service Improvement, People and Partnerships

**Ward(s) affected:** All

#### Purpose of the Report

To appoint Members to committees, elect chairs and vice-chairs and note appointments to Political Group Leader and Deputy Leadership positions.

#### Recommendation

**That Council makes the committee appointments set out in the Appendix to this report and notes the appointed Group Leader/Deputy Leadership positions.**

#### Reasons

In accordance with the requirements of the Constitution, and to enable council business to be conducted through committees (Sections 101 & 102 of the Local Government Act 1972; Section 6 of the Licensing Act 2003) and to comply with the requirements in respect of Scrutiny (Part 1A of the Local Government Act 2000).

## 1. Background

### *Committee Appointments*

- 1.1 The Local Government and Housing Act 1989 ("the 1989 Act") imposes political proportionality requirements in respect of the appointment of committees (other than the Executive). Specific provision is made in Section 15 of the Act as to how proportionality requirements should be prioritised as between the number of seats available on each committee and the number of available committee seats overall.
- 1.2 To meet these requirements, minor adjustments often need to be made where, for instance, a strict calculation results in an entitlement to less than one whole seat on any given committee.
- 1.3 These calculations were last refreshed in the run up to Annual Council in September 2020, to reflect changes that had taken place in the grouping of the Independent Members at that time. At that 23 September 2020 meeting, Council agreed the allocation of available seats amongst the refreshed political groups. In the absence of any change to political groupings in the interim, the allocations agreed at the 23 September 2020 meeting have been brought forward to this meeting.

- 1.4 It now falls to Council to appoint members from the relevant political groups to the seats allocated to those groups. Council will then need to elect a chair and vice-chair for each committee. Nominations made by the groups will be set out in an appendix to be tabled at the meeting.
- 1.5 Government advice on Scrutiny Committees suggests that local authorities might consider it appropriate to have all or some of these committees chaired by members outside the majority group.

#### *Group Leadership/Deputy Leadership*

- 1.6 For completeness, Political Group Leader and Deputy Leadership positions are also reported to Annual Council. These will also be set out in the appendix to this report tabled at the meeting.

## 2. **Issues**

- 2.1 Set out above.

## 3. **Proposal**

- 3.1 That Council makes the committee appointments set out in the Appendix to this report and notes the appointed Group Leader/Deputy Leadership positions.

## 4. **Reasons for Proposed Solution**

- 4.1 To comply with the legislative requirements and Council's Constitution.

## 5. **Options Considered**

- 5.1 Not applicable.

## 6. **Legal and Statutory Implications**

- 6.1 Dealt with in the body of the report

## 7. **Equality Impact Assessment**

- 7.1 Not applicable.

## 8. **Financial and Resource Implications**

- 8.1 There are no significant direct financial or resource implications arising from the proposals. There is no change to the number of chairmanships or vice-chairmanships so no impact on members' allowances.

## 9. **Major Risks**

- 9.1 It is essential that the council's decision making structures and processes are robust and established in line with the relevant legislation and principles of good governance, to minimise the risk of legal challenge. The proposed approach seeks to ensure those aims are met.
- 9.2 The appointment of scrutiny committees enables the Council to achieve enhanced accountability and transparency of decision making process. Scrutiny is

a key element of the Council's executive arrangements and is the main way by which executive decision-makers are held to public account for the discharge of the functions for which they are responsible.

- 9.3 The scrutiny process is a key mechanism for enabling councillors to represent the views of their constituents and other organisations to the cabinet and to the Council and, by examining the operation and impact of the Council's policies, is a useful means of improving the development and delivery of services. Lack of an effective scrutiny function could lead to a lack of democratic accountability for the Council.

10. **UN Sustainable Development Goals (UNSDG)**

10.1 Not applicable.

11. **Key Decision Information**

11.1 This is not a Key Decision.

12. **Earlier Cabinet/Committee Resolutions**

12.1 Not Applicable.

13. **List of Appendices**

13.1 Nominations.

14. **Background Papers**

14.1 Not Applicable.

This page is intentionally left blank

## Notification of Political Groups of the Borough Council

Members are advised that the Proper Officer has received notification, under the provisions of the Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations 1990, of the operation of four political groups on the Council namely:-

NAME & NUMBER OF MEMBERS	DESIGNATED LEADER	DESIGNATED DEPUTY LEADER
CONSERVATIVE	SIMON TAGG	MARK HOLLAND
LABOUR	MIKE STUBBS	DAVE JONES
LIBERAL DEMOCRAT	MARION REDDISH	JUNE WALKLATE
NEWCASTLE INDEPENDENT GROUP	BERT PROCTOR	KEN OWEN
BOROUGH INDEPENDENT GROUP	GARY WHITE	SIMON WHITE

## Representation of Political Groups in Committees and Appointment of Members to Committees

		LABOUR	CONSERVATIVE	LIB DEM	NEWCASTLE INDEPENDENT	BOROUGH INDEPENDENT
--	--	--------	--------------	---------	-----------------------	---------------------

<b>Audit Standards</b>	<b>&amp; 7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
		Sylvia Dymond	Mark Holland		Bert Proctor	
		Sarah Pickup	Barry Panter			
		Mike Stubbs	Paul Warring			
<b>Substitutes</b>						
		Kyle Robinson	Gill Burnett		Ken Owen	
		Gill Williams	Andrew Parker			
			Graham Hutton			

<b>Employment Committee</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
		Andrew Fox-Hewitt	Mark Holland			Gary White
		Elizabeth Shenton	Stephen Sweeney			
		Mike Stubbs	Simon Tagg			
<b>Substitutes</b>						
		John Williams	Helena Maxfield			Simon White
			Paul Northcott			
			Jill Waring			

<b>Licensing &amp; Public Protection</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
		Sylvia Dymond	John Cooper	June Walklate		Simon White
		Dave Jones	Graham Hutton			
		Tony Kearon	Andrew Parker			
		Mark Olszewski	Stephen Sweeney			
		Gill Williams	Gill Heesom			
		John Williams	Jill Waring			
		Ruth Wright				
<b>Substitutes</b>						
		Silvia Burgess	Julie Cooper	Marion Reddish		Gary White
		Sue Moffatt	Trevor Johnson			
			John Tagg			
			Paul Northcott			
			Ian Wilkes			

<b>Conservation Advisory</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
		Allison Gardner	Julie Cooper	June Walklate		
		Annabel Lawley	Trevor Johnson			
<b>Substitutes</b>						
		Elizabeth Shenton	Gill Burnett	Marion Reddish		
			Barry Panter			

<b>Planning</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
		Silvia Burgess	Jenny Cooper	Marion Reddish	Ken Owen	
		Dave Jones	Andrew Fear			
		Sue Moffatt	Helena Maxfield			
		Gill Williams	Paul Northcott			
		John Williams	Mark Holland			
<b>Substitutes</b>						
		Sylvia Dymond	Simon Tagg	June Walklate	Bert Proctor	
		Mike Stubbs	Barry Panter			
			Stephen Sweeney			

<b>Health, Wellbeing &amp; Partnerships SC</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
		Silvia Burgess	Julie Cooper		Bert Proctor	
		Allison Gardner	John Cooper			
		Tony Kearon	Ian Wilkes			
		Sue Moffatt	Barry Panter			
		Ruth Wright	Mark Holland			
<b>Substitutes</b>						
		Andrew Fox-Hewitt	Jenny Cooper		Ken Owen	
		Sarah Pickup	Gill Heesom			
			Graham Hutton			
			Andy Fear			

<b>Economy, Environment &amp; Place SC</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
		David Grocott	Jenny Cooper	Marion Reddish		Gary White
		Dave Jones	Andy Fear			
		Mark Olszewski	Helena Maxfield			
		Amelia Rout	John Tagg			
			Barry Panter			

<b>Substitutes</b>	<b>11</b>					
		Tony Kearon	Andrew Parker	June Walklate		Simon White
			Ian Wilkes			
			Paul Waring			
			Gill Burnett			

<b>Finance, Assets &amp; Performance SC</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
		David Grocott	Gill Burnett		Bert Proctor	
		Tony Kearon	Andy Fear			
		Sarah Pickup	Graham Hutton			
		Amelia Rout	Mark Holland			
		Mike Stubbs	Paul Waring			
<b>Substitutes</b>						
		Dave Jones	John Cooper		Ken Owen	
		Elizabeth Shenton	Barry Panter			
			John Tagg			
			Andrew Parker			

## Appointment of Chairs and Vice-Chairs of Committees (in accordance with Standing Order 46(1))

Members are advised of the following nominations for the positions of Chair and Vice-Chair for the various Committees of the Council. Where there are two nominations (**highlighted in bold**), the Council must vote on which Member to appoint:-

COMMITTEE	CHAIR	VICE-CHAIR
Audit & Standards	<b>Sarah Pickup Paul Waring</b>	<b>Sylvia Dymond Barry Panter</b>
Conservation Advisory	<b>Allison Gardner Julie Cooper</b>	<b>Annabel Lawley Trevor Johnson</b>
Employment Committee	<b>PORTFOLIO HOLDER</b>	<b>NO NOMINATION REQUIRED</b>
Licensing & Public Protection	<b>Mark Olszewski Simon White</b>	<b>Dave Jones Graham Hutton</b>
Planning	<b>John Williams Andy Fear</b>	<b>Sue Moffatt Marion Reddish</b>
Health, Wellbeing & Partnerships SC	<b>Sue Moffatt Ian Wilkes</b>	<b>Ruth Wright Julie Cooper</b>

<b>Economy, Environment &amp; Place SC</b>	<b>Dave Jones Gary White</b>	<b>Amelia Rout Helena Maxfield</b>
<b>Finance, Assets &amp; Performance SC</b>	<b>Mike Stubbs Mark Holland</b>	<b>Sarah Pickup Bert Proctor</b>
<b>MAYOR AND DEPUTY MAYOR NOMINATIONS</b>		
<b>NOMINATION FOR MAYOR</b>	<b>Ken Owen John Williams</b>	-
<b>NOMINATION FOR DEPUTY MAYOR</b>	<b>Gill Burnett Elizabeth Shenton</b>	-



**NEWCASTLE-UNDER-LYME BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT TEAM'S  
REPORT TO**

**Council  
19 May 2021**

**Report Title: External Roles and Appointments**

**Submitted by: Chief Executive**

**Portfolios: All**

**Ward(s) affected: All**

**Purpose of the Report**

To note the position in respect of external roles and appointments.

**Recommendation**

**That Council notes the position in respect of external roles and appointments.**

**Reasons**

The Council, through full Council or the Cabinet, makes a variety of appointments to external positions within various third sector, partner and community organisations. Some of the appointments are automatic by virtue of a Councillor's Ward Member role. Some appointments are made annually, some for longer. Some positions qualify for an allowance, others do not. The purpose of this report is to bring together in one place a list and description of the various appointments for consideration by Council at each Annual meeting to ensure that appointments remain current, relevant and transparent.

**1. Background**

1.1 Members will be familiar with a report taken to each Annual Council dealing with appointments to "Outside Bodies". Appointments previously made were made up to 2022 to coincide with the electoral cycle. To ensure that the annual report captures appointments to roles as well as specific bodies, that it covers appointments made by Council and Cabinet, and that all appointments remain current, relevant and transparent, an updated list is presented to Council for information, with the intention that each subsequent Annual Council receives an update on the same, with a request to refresh appointments where necessary.

**2. Issues**

2.1 Whilst there are not currently any appointments to be made by Council, it is considered important that Council maintains visibility on the full range of external roles. Annual visibility of an updated list ensures transparency, but also ensures that members are clear about the roles they have been appointed to fulfil so that they are best able to attend any relevant meetings and represent the Council on the body or in the role in question, and provide a conduit back into the Council for issues arising externally. An outdated list can lead to missed opportunities for partnership working.

3. **Proposal**

3.1 The list of appointments to external roles as it is currently understood is shown in the appendix to this report. A number of enquiries are still active to make sure that this list is complete, and to ensure that the roles mentioned are still relevant and required. Members are invited to contact the Monitoring Officer separately if they feel any of the information in the appendix is inaccurate or incomplete.

3.2 There are no appointments to be made currently.

4. **Reasons for Proposed Solution**

4.1 To ensure that appointments remain current, relevant and transparent.

5. **Options Considered**

5.1 Not applicable

6. **Legal and Statutory Implications**

6.1 Not applicable

7. **Equality Impact Assessment**

7.1 Appointment to and active involvement in a number of these roles enables the Council and Councillors to influence positive outcomes in respect of its public sector equality duties.

8. **Financial and Resource Implications**

8.1 Not applicable

9. **Major Risks**

9.1 The main risk is the lost potential for enhanced partnership working if the Council and its Members are not aware of or able to actively participate in appointed outside roles.

10. **UN Sustainable Development Goals (UNSDG)**

10.1 Not directly relevant.

11. **Key Decision Information**

11.1 This is not a Key Decision

12. **Earlier Cabinet/Committee Resolutions**

12.1 Not Applicable

13. **List of Appendices**

13.1 List of current appointments to external roles

14. **Background Papers**

14.1 N/A

This page is intentionally left blank

## External Roles of Members – Community Groups

Name of Organisation/ Role	Description of Organisation / Role	Appointed by	Current Appointee(s)	Term of Appointment	Nominations for re-appointment
<p>Community Centres Management Committees:</p> <p>Audley Bradwell Lodge Community Centre * Butt Lane Chesterton Clayton Crackley Harriet Higgins Knutton Marsh Hall Ramsay Road Red Street Silverdale, Park Road Silverdale, Social Centre Whitfield Wye Road</p> <p>CIC – Community Interest Group (Appoints own Directors)</p>	<p>The Management Committees hold regular meetings, usually monthly, to decide on how the organisation should operate the community centre on a day to day basis.</p>	<p>Council (up to 3 members on each)</p>	<p>Ward members automatically become the Council's nominated representatives for community centres situated within their wards for the period of their office, negating the need to make specific nominations each year</p> <p>Ward Members do not have voting rights unless co-opted or elected to the Management Committee</p>	<p>Every 4 years  (18/05/2022)</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Residents' Associations are made up of local residents (tenants and/or homeowners) who represent the interests of everyone living in a particular area or building. They come together to represent the views of all residents in their area to help make their neighbourhood a better place to live.

Council

Ward Members automatically become the Council's nominated for any Residents Association within their ward for the period of their office, negating the need to make specific nominations each year.

Ward Members do not have voting rights unless co-opted or elected to the Residents Association.

Every 4 years  
(18/05/2022)

N/A

## External Roles of Members

Name of Organisation/ Role	Description of Organisation / Role	Appointed by	Current Appointee(s)	Term of Appointment	Nominations for re-appointment
Age UK – Staffordshire	A local charity, working in the community to support older people, their families and carers.	To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council		To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council	To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council
Homestart, Newcastle-under-Lyme	A community network of trained volunteers helping families with young children.	To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council		To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council	To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council
Keele University Nominations Committee	Identifying appropriate lay members of Council and its Committees, identifying appropriate members of the College of Fellows and nominations for the appointment of the Chancellor	To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council		To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council	To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council
Marie Curie Fundraising Group – Newcastle-under-Lyme	Raising funds for the local hospice	To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council		To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council	To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council

North Staffs Relate	Providing relationship support to people of all ages, backgrounds, sexual orientation and gender identities	To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council		To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council	To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council
Silverdale Primary Academy	Primary School Education	To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council	Cllr Rout	1 year	Cllr Rout
Sir John Offley Almshouse Trust	Charity run Housing situated in Madeley	N/A	Madeley Ward Cllr. Cllr S White	5 years	N/A
Staffordshire Planning Forum	<p>Ensuring that the Staffordshire authorities and their electorates are appropriately represented in matters relating to strategic planning and regeneration.</p> <p>To keep under constant review Staffordshire's involvement in regional planning and sub-regional matters:</p>	To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council		To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council	To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council

Trustee of Maddock, Leicester and Burslem Fund	Awarding small grants and bursaries, to promote the education of <i>young people who reside or have a parent residing within the boundaries of the City of Stoke on Trent and the Borough of Newcastle under Lyme.</i>	To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council	No representative although they have sought one in the past	To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council	To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council
Wenger House Committee	Probation Service	To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council	Cllr Shenton	To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council	Cllr Shenton
Go Kidsgrove	Community Interest Company promoting local businesses and events.	1 member/ Council	Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth	1 year	Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth
Stoke-on-Trent and North Staffordshire Theatre Trust Limited (New Victoria Theatre)	A charity for people of all ages/backgrounds – using the power of theatre to change lives.	1 member/ Council	Leader	4 years	N/A

<p>Aspire Housing Board</p> <p>Page 46</p>	<p>Provider of homes for rent and homes for shared ownership.</p>	<p>1 member/ Council (£5,000 p/a paid by Aspire)</p>	<p>Cllr Northcott</p>	<p>Maximum 6 year term. Cllr Northcott was appointed on 4th June 2019</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Campaign to Protect Rural England - County Branch</p>	<p>Works to make the countryside of Staffordshire a better place for everyone to live, work and enjoy.</p>	<p>up to 2 members/ Council</p>	<p>Cllr Panter</p>	<p>At the discretion of the Council</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Local Government Association –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual Conference:</li> <li>• General Assembly</li> <li>• Rural Commission</li> <li>• Urban Commission</li> </ul>	<p>The ‘parliament of Local Government’</p>	<p>1 member/ Council</p>	<p>Leader</p>	<p>Role is for Leader or their substitute</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Locality Action Partnerships:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Audley</li> <li>• Betley, Keele and Madeley</li> <li>• Butt Lane and Talke</li> <li>• East Newcastle</li> <li>• Greater Chesterton</li> <li>• Kidsgrove</li> <li>• Partnership of Western Communities</li> <li>• Newcastle Rural</li> <li>• Newcastle South</li> </ul>	<p>These represent the Newcastle Partnership’s established infrastructure for the delivery of locality working and offer communities access to a range of partners.</p>	<p>Council</p>	<p>The LAP constitutions state that membership is open to “Any County or District Councillor representing any part of the area” - this negates the need to make specific nominations annually.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Business Improvement District	Works with partner organisations to lobby, support and deliver a range of projects and events in the BID area	1 member/ Council	Leader	1 April 2021 – 31 March 2026	Leader
Newcastle Partnership	<p>Representing different sectors in the Borough and playing a vital role in bringing together a range of organisations through co-operative and co-ordinated joint working to improve social, economic and environmental wellbeing for residents.</p> <p>It is committed to continuously improving the quality of life and experiences of people, who live, work, invest, study and visit Newcastle</p>	1 + sub member/ Council	Leader	To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council	Leader (substitute Deputy Leader)

<p>“Enjoy Staffordshire” Destination Management Partnership</p> <p>Page 48</p>	<p>A partnership between the public sector and private sector – to bring more visitors into Staffordshire. The partnership has a board of members representing all parts of the county and all elements of the industry.</p>	<p>1 member/ Council</p>	<p>To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council</p>	<p>To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council</p>	<p>Portfolio Holder for Leisure, Culture and Heritage</p>
<p>Staffordshire County Council Healthy Staffordshire Select Committee</p>	<p>Responsible for scrutinising the commissioning and delivery of health services in Staffordshire County Council’s area, with the aim of helping to reduce health inequalities.</p>	<p>1 member/ Council</p>	<p>Chair of Health, Wellbeing and Partnerships Scrutiny</p>	<p>1 year</p>	<p>Chair of Health, Wellbeing and Partnerships Scrutiny Committee</p>

Staffordshire Health and Wellbeing Board	To lead improvement of health and well-being and to oversee transformation of health and care services in Staffordshire. This includes conversations with the public about how they can improve their own health and well-being.	1 member/ Council	Leader or relevant portfolio holder	To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council	Leader or relevant portfolio holder (if required)
Staffordshire LGA – Waste Board	The Board are responsible for co-ordinating the successful delivery of the objectives set out in the Strategy for the effective management of municipal waste in Staffordshire.	1 member/ Council	Portfolio Holder for Environment and Recycling	1 year	Portfolio Holder for Environment and Recycling

<p>Staffordshire Police, Fire and Crime Panel</p> <p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 50</p>	<p>The role of the Panel is to scrutinise the Police, Fire and Crime Commissioner, to promote openness in the transaction of Police and Fire and Rescue business and also to support the Commissioner in the effective exercise of their functions.</p>	<p>1+ sub member/ Council (£920.04 p.a. paid by the PFCP)</p>	<p>Portfolio Holder for Community Safety and Wellbeing</p>	<p>1 year</p>	<p>Portfolio Holder for Community Safety and Wellbeing</p>
<p>Stoke-on-Trent and Staffordshire Enterprise Partnership</p>	<p>The Partnership works to bring together businesses and local authorities to drive economic growth, create jobs and raise skills levels.</p>	<p>1 member/ Council</p>	<p>Leader</p>	<p>Role is for the Council Leader or their substitute</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Waste and Mineral Site Liaison Committee – Acton Composting Site (Committee is Active)</p> <p><b>ONE elected member</b> (whose ward is not specified in any related S106 agreement) - the site lies within the Loggerheads and Whitmore ward</p>	<p>Overseeing the operation of mineral or waste developments. The Committee ensures continued communication and cooperation with the community, operator, the Council and interested parties</p>	<p>1 member/ Council</p>	<p>Cllr Hutton</p>	<p>To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council</p>	<p>Cllr Hutton</p>

<p>Waste and Mineral Site Liaison Committee – Knutton Quarry (Committee is Active)</p> <p><b>TWO elected members</b> (the quarry lies predominately within the Knutton and Silverdale ward, with a small part located within the Silverdale and Parkside ward. There is a section 106 agreement that requires the liaison committee and for invitations for membership of up to two elected councillors. Whilst there are no conditions dictating which wards the councillors should be drawn from, it should be noted that this committee also determines community projects and the level of financial support from the S106 funds. These projects must be located within the Silverdale and Knutton ward.</p>	<p>Overseeing the operation of mineral or waste developments. The Committee ensures continued communication and cooperation with the community, operator, the Council and interested parties</p>	<p>2 members/ Council</p>	<p>Cllr B Johnson  Cllr Rout</p>	<p>To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council</p>	<p>Cllr B Johnson  Cllr Rout</p>
<p>Waste and Mineral Site Liaison Committee – Keele (Madeley Heath) Quarry (Committee not yet Active)</p> <p><b>TWO elected members</b> (whose wards are not specified in any related S106 agreement) - the quarry lies within the Madeley ward</p>	<p>Overseeing the operation of mineral or waste developments. The Committee ensures continued communication and cooperation with the community, operator, the Council and interested parties</p>	<p>2 members/ Council</p>	<p>Cllr S White  Cllr G White</p>	<p>To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council</p>	<p>Cllr S White  Cllr G White</p>

<p>Waste and Mineral Site Liaison Committee –Holditch House Waste Site (Committee not yet Active <i>(however as permission implemented August 2016, the County Council will be pushing the operator to arrange a meeting soon)</i>)</p> <p><b>ONE elected member</b> (whose ward is not specified in any related S106 agreement) - the site lies within the Holditch ward</p>	<p>Overseeing the operation of mineral or waste developments. The Committee ensures continued communication and cooperation with the community, operator, the Council and interested parties</p>	<p>1 member</p>	<p>Cllr Owen</p>	<p>To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council</p>	<p>Cllr Owen</p>
---	--	-----------------	------------------	--	------------------

<p>Waste and Mineral Site Liaison Committee –Walleys Landfill Site (Committee is Active)</p> <p><b>FOUR elected members (*previously six)</b> Red Industries have taken over as owners and operators of the site and a unilateral undertaking has formalised the previously voluntary liaison committee (reference N.12/09/216 MW approved 26/5/2016), reducing the number of invited Borough Council elected members from 6 to 4.</p> <p>The unilateral undertaking specifies that Red Industries must invite four elected councillors on behalf of the Borough Council, plus two elected councillors from Staffordshire County Council, one elected councillor on behalf of Silverdale Parish Council and one on behalf of Knutton Parish Council (albeit that Knutton Parish Council does not exist). The undertaking does not specify from which wards the Borough Council elected members should be drawn. Walley’s Landfill site lies within the Thistleberry ward but also adjoins the Knutton and Silverdale and Silverdale and Parkside wards.</p>	<p>Overseeing the operation of mineral or waste developments. The Committee ensures continued communication and cooperation with the community, operator, the Council and interested parties</p>	<p>6 members Council</p>	<p>Cllr Reddish Cllr Rout Cllr Jones Cllr B Johnson</p>	<p>To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council</p>	<p>Cllr Reddish Cllr Rout Cllr Jones Cllr B Johnson</p>
<p>West Midland Reserve Forces and Cadets Association</p>	<p>Made up of volunteers from across the region. Supporting the Reserve Forces and Cadets from the Royal Navy, Royal Marines, Army and Royal Air Force within Staffordshire and other Counties.</p>	<p>1 member/ Council</p>	<p>Cllr Sweeney</p>	<p>To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council</p>	<p>Cllr Sweeney</p>

<p>District Councils Network</p> <p>Page 54</p>	<p>The District Councils' Network is a cross-party member led network of 180 district councils. It is a Special Interest Group of the Local Government Association and provides a single voice for all district councils within the Local Government Association.</p>	<p>1 member/ Council</p>	<p>Leader</p>	<p>Role is for Council Leader or their substitute</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>LGiU Assembly</p>	<p>A local authority membership organisation. Members are councils and other organisations with an interest in local government from across the UK. Support is provided to officers and councillors.</p>	<p>1 member/ Council</p>	<p>Cllr Julie Cooper</p>	<p>To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council</p>	<p>Cllr Julie Cooper</p>
<p>Newcastle-under-Lyme Almshouse Association</p>	<p>Charity run housing – comprising 5 bungalows providing accommodation for single ladies, over the age of 60 and in need of affordable housing.</p>	<p>2 members/  N/A</p>	<p>Cross Heath Ward members automatically become the Council's nominated representatives for the period of their office, negating the need to make specific nominations each year</p>	<p>4 years</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Armed Forces Community Covenant	The Armed Forces Covenant is a promise by the nation ensuring that those who serve or have served in the armed forces, and their families are treated fairly.	1 member/ Council	Cllr Panter	To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council	Cllr Panter
Corporate Parenting Panel	The Corporate Parenting Panel supports the Council to ensure that it is fulfilling its duties towards those children looked after corporately. It also oversees the services provided to children and young people in care.	1 member/ Cabinet	Cllr J Waring	To Be Confirmed for 2022 Annual Council	Cllr Jill Waring

This page is intentionally left blank



**NEWCASTLE-UNDER-LYME BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT TEAM'S  
REPORT TO**

**Council  
19 May 2021**

**Report Title:**           **Calendar of Meetings 2021/22**

**Submitted by:**       **Chief Executive**

**Portfolios:**           **All**

**Ward(s) affected:**   **N/A**

**Purpose of the Report**

To note the calendar of meetings for 2021/22, and to remind members of the recommencement of the “6 Month Rule”

**Recommendation**

**That Council notes:**

- 1) the dates and times of the meetings as listed at appendix A**
- 2) that the operation of the “6 month rule”, which will result in the disqualification of any member who does not attend a meeting in their capacity as Borough Councillor, recommends for all Councillors from and including the 19 May 2021 Annual Council Meeting**

**Reasons**

To comply with the Constitution and, in respect of the “6 month rule” previous resolutions of this Council.

**1. Background**

1.1 In respect of the Calendar of Meetings, Appendix 7 of the Council’s Constitution states that:-

*‘The Council will decide when its meetings will take place. Details will be contained in a calendar of meetings which will be approved by the Council.’*

1.2 The Calendar of Meetings for the period to and including 2021/22 was set by Council at its meeting on 16 May 2018. The remaining meetings for the 2021/22 municipal year are attached at appendix A for information.

1.3 In respect of the “6 Month Rule”, members will recall that an Urgent Decision was taken by the Chief Executive on behalf of Council on 28 April 2020 in light of the national lock-down then in place because of the Covid-19 pandemic. The decision was taken in accordance with Section 85(1) of the Local Government Act 1972 to suspend the operation of that section which would otherwise have had the effect of resulting in the automatic disqualification of any Councillor who had not attended an official meeting in their capacity as a borough Councillor in any rolling 6 month period.

1.4 At its Annual Meeting on 23 September 2020, Council resolved to extend the suspension of the 6 Month rule until the next Annual Council Meeting. Accordingly, from the commencement of this Annual Council meeting the “6 Month Rule” is back in operation. For those members in attendance at this meeting, a fresh period of 6 months is commenced from the date of this meeting. For those members not at this meeting, the time period within which they must attend another meeting is to be calculated by taking a period of 6 months, less the time between 28 April 2020 and the date of the last meeting they attended before 28 April 2020. Members are invited to contact the Monitoring Officer to discuss in the event of any individual questions or concerns.

2. **Issues**

2.1 Set out above.

3. **Proposal**

3.1 That Council notes:

- 1) the dates and times of the meetings as listed at appendix A; and
- 2) that the operation of the “6 month rule”, which will result in the disqualification of any member who does not attend a meeting in their capacity as Borough Councillor, recommences for all Councillors from and including the 19 May 2021 Annual Council Meeting

4. **Reasons for Proposed Solution**

4.1 To comply with the Constitution and previous resolutions of Council

5. **Options Considered**

5.1 None

6. **Legal and Statutory Implications**

6.1 These are set out in the body of the report.

7. **Equality Impact Assessment**

7.1 The legal requirement to attend council meetings on a physical or face to face basis, combined with the operation of Section 85(1) of the Local Government Act 1972 may adversely impact on those who are unable to attend physical meetings on account of a protected characteristic. Not accommodating the impacts of that would be in breach of the council’s public sector equality duties. This risk can, however, be adequately mitigated by taking steps that will vary depending on the circumstances of each individual case. Any Member concerned about the interaction of the requirement to attend face to face meetings and the effect of Section 85(1) is invited to contact the Monitoring Officer to discuss.

8. **Financial and Resource Implications**

8.1 There are resource implications arising from the proposal.

9. **Major Risks**

9.1 The risks and proposed mitigation measures are set out above.

10. **UN Sustainable Development Goals (UNSDG)**

10.1 Not Applicable.

11. **Key Decision Information**

11.1 This is not a Key Decision.

12. **Earlier Cabinet/Committee Resolutions**

12.1 The Urgent Decision taken on behalf of Council on 28 April 2020 and the Council resolution (Item 15) of 23 September 2020.

13. **List of Appendices**

13.1 Not Applicable

14. **Background Papers**

14.1 The Urgent Decision and Council resolution referred to, available here:-

<https://moderngov.newcastle-staffs.gov.uk/mgCommitteeDetails.aspx?ID=152>

This page is intentionally left blank

**(meetings commence at 7pm unless otherwise agreed by each Committee)**

<b>May 2021</b>				
Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
3 Bank Holiday	4	5	6	7
10	11	12	13 4.30pm Heritage Cabinet Panel	14
17	18 6.00pm CAWP	19 Annual Council	20	21
24 Finance, Assets & Performance SC	25	26	27 Planning	28
31 Bank Holiday				

<b>June 2021</b>				
Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
	1	2	3	4
7 Health, Wellbeing & Partnerships SC	8 Licensing & Public Protection	9 2.00pm Cabinet	10	11
14	15 6.30pm CAWP	16	17 Economy, Environment & Place SC	18
21	22 Planning	23	24 Finance, Assets & Performance SC	25
28	29	30		

**(meetings commence at 7pm unless otherwise agreed by each Committee)**

<b>July 2021</b>				
Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
			1	2
5	6	7 2.00pm Cabinet	8 4.30pm Heritage Cabinet Panel	9
12	13 6.30pm CAWP	14	15	16
19	20 Planning	21 Council	22	23
26 Audit & Standards	27 Licensing & Public Protection	28	29	30

<b>August 2021</b>				
Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
2	3	4	5	6
9	10 6.30pm CAWP	11	12	13
16	17 Planning	18	19	20
23	24	25	26	27
30 Bank Holiday	31			

*(meetings commence at 7pm unless otherwise agreed by each Committee)*

<b>September 2021</b>				
Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
		1	2	3
6	7 6.30pm CAWP	8 2.00pm Cabinet	9 4.30pm Heritage Cabinet Panel	10
13 Health, Wellbeing & Partnerships SC	14 Planning	15	16	17
20	21 Licensing & Public Protection	22 Council	23	24
27 Audit & Standards	28	29 Economy, Environment & Place SC	30	

<b>October 2021</b>				
Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
				1
4	5 6.30pm CAWP	6	7	8
11	12 Planning	13 2.00pm Cabinet	14	15
18	19	20	21	22
25	26	27	28	29

**(meetings commence at 7pm unless otherwise agreed by each Committee)**

<b>November 2021</b>				
Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1	2 6.30pm CAWP  Licensing & Public Protection	3 2.00pm Cabinet	4	5
8 Audit & Standards	9 Planning	10	11 4.30pm Heritage Cabinet Panel	12
15	16	17 Council	18	19
22	23	24	25	26
29	30 6.30pm CAWP			

<b>December 2021</b>				
Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
		1 2.00pm Cabinet	2	3
6 Health, Wellbeing & Partnership SC	7 Planning	8	9	10
13	14	5	16 Economy, Environment & Place SC	17
20 Finance, Assets & Performance SC	21	22	23	24
27 Bank Holiday	28 Bank Holiday	29 Office Closed	30 Office Closed	31 Office Closed

**(meetings commence at 7pm unless otherwise agreed by each Committee)**

<b>January 2022</b>				
Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
3 6.30pm CAWP	4 Planning	5	6	7
10	11	12 2.00pm Cabinet	13 4.30pm Heritage Cabinet Panel	14
17	18 Licensing & Public Protection	19	20	21
24	25 6.30pm CAWP	26 Council	27	28
31				

<b>February 2022</b>				
Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
	1 Planning	2 2.00pm Cabinet	3	4
7 Audit & Standards	8	9	10	11
14	15	16	17	18
21	22 6.30pm CAWP	23 Council (Budget)	24	25
28				

**(meetings commence at 7pm unless otherwise agreed by each Committee)**

<b>March 2022</b>				
<b>Monday</b>	<b>Tuesday</b>	<b>Wednesday</b>	<b>Thursday</b>	<b>Friday</b>
	1 Planning	2	3	4
7 Health, Wellbeing & Partnership SC	8	9	10 4.30pm Heritage Cabinet Panel	11
14	15 Licensing & Public Protection	16	17 Economy, Environment & Place SC	18
21	22 6.30pm CAWP	23 2.00pm Cabinet	24 Finance, Assets & Performance SC	25
28	29 Planning	30	31	

<b>April 2022</b>				
<b>Monday</b>	<b>Tuesday</b>	<b>Wednesday</b>	<b>Thursday</b>	<b>Friday</b>
				1
4	5	6 Council	7	8
11	12	13	14	15 Bank Holiday
18 Bank Holiday	19 6.30pm CAWP	20 2.00pm Cabinet	21	22
25 Audit & Standards	26 Planning	27 Licensing & Public Protection	28	29

**(meetings commence at 7pm unless otherwise agreed by each Committee)**

May 2022				
Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
2 Bank Holiday	3	4	5 ELECTIONS	6
9	10	11	12	13
16	17	18 ANNUAL COUNCIL	19 4.30pm Heritage Cabinet Panel	20
23	24 6.30pm CAWP	25	26 Planning	27
30	31			

June 2022				
		1	2 Bank Holiday	3 Platinum Jubilee Holiday
6	7	8 Cabinet	9	10
13	14	15 Economy, Environment & Place SC	16	17 Members Welcome Day
20	21 6.30pm CAWP	22	23 Health Wellbeing & Partnerships SC	24
27 Audit & Standards	28 Planning	29 Licensing & Public Protection	30 Finance Assets & Performance SC	

Updated:6/2/2020

This page is intentionally left blank



**NEWCASTLE-UNDER-LYME BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT TEAM'S  
REPORT TO**

**Council**  
**19 May 2021**

**Report Title:** Confirmation of the Constitution  
**Submitted by:** Chief Executive  
**Portfolios:** Corporate & Service Improvement, People & Partnerships  
**Ward(s) affected:** N/A

**Purpose of the Report**

For Council to confirm the content of the Constitution

**Recommendation**

**That Council notes that there are no new amendments made or proposed to the Council's constitution, and that its content as currently drawn (16/12/20), including the various schemes of delegation, are confirmed.**

**Reasons**

The Constitution requires Council, at its Annual Meeting to:

*"Agree the scheme of delegation (excluding any executive delegations which the Leader has responsibility for)"*

1. **Background**

1.1 Whilst amendments made or proposed are reported to and confirmed by Council on a regular basis, there is a requirement in the Constitution to agree the scheme of delegation at Annual Council. The Scheme of Delegation is set out in the Constitution. Accordingly, whilst there have been no changes to the Constitution since those approved at the 16 December meeting of Council, council is asked to confirm the content of the Constitution as at that date in keeping with the requirement set out in the Constitution.

2. **Issues**

2.1 Set out above.

3. **Proposal**

3.1 That Council notes that there are no new amendments made or proposed to the Council's constitution, and that its content as currently drawn (16/12/20), including the various schemes of delegation, are confirmed.

4. **Reasons for Proposed Solution**

4.1 As required by the Constitution.

5. **Options Considered**

5.1 Not applicable.

6. **Legal and Statutory Implications**

6.1 None.

7. **Equality Impact Assessment**

7.1 None.

8. **Financial and Resource Implications**

8.1 None.

9. **Major Risks**

9.1 Having put itself under an obligation to do so through the passage of the Constitution referred to, there is a risk that if the Council does not confirm its scheme of delegation as it says it will, decisions subsequently taken in accordance with that scheme of delegation could be challenged on the basis that the Scheme was not duly confirmed.

10. **UN Sustainable Development Goals (UNSDG)**

10.1 Not applicable.

11. **Key Decision Information**

11.1 This is not a Key Decision

12. **Earlier Cabinet/Committee Resolutions**

12.1 Not applicable.

13. **List of Appendices**

13.1 Not applicable.

14. **Background Papers**

14.1 Not applicable.