

Frodsham Town Council

Minutes of the meeting of

Frodsham Town Council

Held on Monday 28 July 2014 at 7.30pm

In the Lounge, Frodsham Community Centre, Frodsham



Present: Cllrs Warren (Chair), Wales, Ashton, Bondi, Brown, Dawson, Kelly, Pusey, Pennington, Redhead, Riley, Shearn, Sutton, Taylor & Wakefield. Mr J Wild (Town Clerk), Mrs A Scriven (Office Manager)
1 member of the press and 9 members of the public.

Meeting 5

The personal interests of Cllr S L Riley & Cllr A W Dawson on this agenda are noted on the basis that they are both elected members of this Council & CWAC. Cllr Dawson is also a member of the Police & Crime Panel. Cllrs Dawson, Pusey, Riley, & Wakefield are members of Frodsham Foundation.

Part A		
No	Item	Note/Decision/Action
68	Apologies for Absence	Cllr A Oulton
69	Declarations of Interest	
	<p>Cllr Pusey re Sutton Parish Council, Frodsham Community Association & Frodsham Foundation. Cllr Redhead & Cllr Shearn re Frodsham Youth Association Cllr Bondi re Frodsham Water Sports. Cllr Pennington & Cllr Wakefield re London Road Allotments Cllr Dawson & Cllr Riley reiterated the interests listed above along with items relating to Castle Park House (item 79), Christmas Festival (item 80) & TRO 865 – Sutton Weaver Swing Bridge (item 84.1)</p>	
70	Frodsham Foundation	
	<p>Cllr Wakefield reported that the recent NEETS training course has resulted in a new apprentice being employed, and other ongoing projects. Cllr Pusey reported that he had been appointed to the Foundation Board, as FTC representative. The Chairman thanked all involved for their work – and mentioned Cllr Brown, who had offered free driving lessons.</p>	
71	Local Police: To receive report (if PC/PCSO is available)	
	<p>PCSO was not in attendance, but a written report was provided and is being made available with these minutes. Cllr Wakefield reported on her recent attendance on a night shift with the PCSO and encouraged other councillors to attend.</p>	
72	Opportunity for Public to Speak	
	<p><i>Mr. Dillon</i> reported his concerns relating to overgrown hedges in the area of Park Lane & Queensway, which he feared could result in an accident if pedestrians, particularly those pushing prams, were forced to walk in the road. He had raised with CWAC the previous year, and work had been done. More work was needed. He also expressed concern about the condition of the roads around Kingsway, Princeway and Martin Road where, he said, building wagons had broken up the surface and pothole repairs had left an uneven surface. This, along with uneven footpaths, presented a tripping hazard. It was recognised there had been a burst of growth with the warm, wet weather, but concerns were raised that it was difficult to report such issues. These were primarily CWaC matters and Cllr Riley suggested that a CWAC Officer responsible for these matters be invited to speak to Council at a future meeting to explain the reporting process. Clerk to consider. Action: Clerk Cllr Bondi agreed that overgrown hedges were a problem in many areas of Frodsham. More funding might be needed, though a harder cut in winter might help. Cllr Riley described CWaC's process of fixing potholes and said that a lot of money was being spent on footpaths. Nevertheless, it made CWaC's job easier if problems were reported. She mentioned dangerous potholes in particular. There was a single point of referral at CWaC for these things, and it was the best way to report. Nevertheless, she agreed to report these particular concerns and to chase up a response. Action: Cllr Riley <i>Mr. Edghill</i> reported on the success of the 2014 Festival of Football and informed Council that £7,100 had been raised, to be distributed to various community groups. The Chairman congratulated him on a successful weekend. <i>Mrs. Whitby</i> requested further information on the Churchfields play scheme start date. The Chairman said that funding had been applied for, but was still awaited, with further news due soon.</p>	

73	Minutes of Meetings 3 & 4 - 24 June & 15 July 2014
	Both sets of minutes were approved by Council as a true and accurate record of the respective meetings, and were to be signed by the Chair, following some amendments (reported in item 74).
74	Matters Arising from each
74.1	Meeting 3 – 24 June 2014
	<p><i>Item 47.2:</i> Theatre in the Quarter – Cllr Taylor had not, for technical reasons, received the email request for funds. Nonetheless, the appropriate documentation had been supplied to the group, and it had not returned this. There was no further action planned by the WW1 group on this matter, at this time.</p> <p><i>Item 51.1, R4 -</i> Cllr Taylor asked that the whole sum be taken from the grants budget, not as recalled/recorded by the Clerk, with £200 coming from the Chairman’s allowance.</p> <p>Action: Clerk</p> <p><i>Item 62:</i> Cllr Pennington asked that the record show all the names of people who had taken part in the named vote. The Clerk had so far just recorded the names of those who had voted against, with all other being for, In future he was asked to record the names of all who voted for and against.</p> <p>Full list of names on this occasion was:</p> <p><i>For:</i> Cllrs Wales, Bondi, Brown, Dawson, Kelly, Redhead, Sutton and Taylor.</p> <p><i>Against:</i> Cllrs Pennington, Pusey and Oulton</p> <p><i>No abstentions,</i> and Chair did not vote.</p> <p>Otherwise, minutes agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting.</p>
74.2	Meeting 4 – 15 July 2014
	<p><i>Item 54:</i> Cllr Pusey raised the matter of the Governance Review Committee and the renaming of Frodsham wards. FTC had agreed at its last meeting that it wished to keep the “compass points” names as now. The Chairman had offered to attend the Committee to speak to this, but had been told that the Town Council view was known, so this was not necessary. Cllr Pusey was concerned at the reports he had received from the meeting – specifically that Cllr Dawson, who had been present, had recommended different names. Cllr Pusey understood that the Officer in charge had not been in the room at the time, so FTC’s voice was not heard.</p> <p>Cllr Dawson explained that events had in fact been different: the Officer had been present, and FTC’s views were made known. Other committee members had argued against the compass point names, with Cllr Dawson speaking third. He had made clear that he was NOT the FTC delegate. Cllr Dawson felt he had been consistent in his own views, that we could do better than compass points.</p> <p>Cllr Pusey apologised that he (Cllr Pusey) seemed to have been misinformed. He however proposed that FTC write to the Officer, stressing that the Council wished to keep compass point names.</p> <p>Currently names were shown as: North (Frodsham Waterside), South (Overton and Five Crosses, East (Frodsham Lakes), and West (Castle Park). An argument could be made that people did not identify with compass points so much as landmarks in their area. Changes would take effect on election day next year.</p> <p>It was agreed that the official minutes would be awaited, and responded to as necessary.</p>
<i>Item 80 was brought forward by the Chair</i>	
80	Christmas Festival
	<p>FTC had received the report and toolkit from Frodsham Foundation and it was now necessary to decide how to proceed this year. The Foundation was less able to help and Love Frodsham had no chair. Cllr Pusey said he was willing to stand as Chair of Love Frodsham, as it repositioned itself as more of a Christmas Committee. The recent survey had demonstrated a desire for a Christmas festival,</p> <p>There were a number of new ideas around – such as reporting the procession and resisting the Christmas market. More use might be made of the Community Centre and more young people involved.</p> <p>Cllr Pusey said that some local businesses were willing to contribute financially and otherwise, Cllr Pusey would come back to FTC if there remained shortfall of funds. Cllrs Dawson and Riley had offered support already through their members’ grants. The Chairman thanked Cllr Pusey for the proactive approach he was taking – he welcomed the involvement of local businesses, which was a win-win situation.</p>
<i>Item 84.1 (Councillor’s Items) was brought forward by the Chair</i>	
84.1	TRO 865 Sutton Weaver Swing Bridge: to consider response – Cllr M Pusey
	<p>Cllr Riley left the room for this item in view of her CWAC responsibility for this matter.</p> <p>Cllr Pusey said that his impression was that senior officers at CWAC were against the proposed TRO, as was Sutton Weaver Council. He asked whether FTC was to take a view as a Council. His view was that the A56 should not be split. This was for safety reasons, as well as the convenience of local residents on Halton Station Road. A local trader had complained of cars using his yard to turn round, to avoid the longer journey.</p>

84.1 c'td	<p>In the longer term he wondered if a roundabout was the right option, although this would be costly. In the short term he was concerned about the existing islands and signal wiring. Once removed they would be very difficult to reinstate. He felt FTC should object.</p> <p>The Chairman asked if it was right that FTC responded, as the junction was not in Frodsham, and consensus amongst the Council was unlikely. In that situation, should Councillors respond individually?</p> <p>Councillor Dawson felt individuals should respond themselves. He saw three options;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Returning to traffic lights, but with no left hand filter. 2. As proposed, with no lights. 3. A roundabout – though there was no room as things stood, and no space to slow traffic. <p>He said he was aware that many people were objecting. He had received good feedback on the present arrangements.</p> <p>The point was made that we had asked in our recent survey whether lights were supported. No other options had been mentioned. The questionnaire did not mention that the lights option would include a move to reduce to two lanes.</p> <p>Some Councillors felt that the flow worked better with the present arrangement, and that if we could not have three lanes, this was the next best solution. On the other hand, it cut across the cycle strategy, and might represent an “undemocratic” use of the road.</p> <p>It was necessary that FTC make a swift decision on this, as the TRO consultation was ending in early August.</p> <p>On balance it was decided that the Council would respond – with the majority view being against the TRO. Objection letter to be drafted by the Chairman and sent through the Clerk. The objection would refer to issues around safety, not wishing to split the A56 and disruption of cycle lanes.</p>
--------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Item 79 was brought forward by the Chair

79	<p>Castle Park House</p> <p>Cllr Dawson reiterated his interest as Executive Chair of Castle Park House Trust.</p> <p>He said that he felt more could be done with Castle Park House in terms of services for Frodsham's people and to raise income. He felt that closer working between FTC, the Arts Centre and the Trust/CWaC would be advantageous.</p> <p>The present arrangements throw up some anomalies: eg, the rear car park being just for the Arts Centre and the fact that the Arts Centre had a full repairing lease but had to turn to CWaC for financial help.</p> <p>He would like to see FTC playing a bigger role. FTC had budgeted £10k in its current budget to buy a seat at the table. He could see benefit in involving FTC in promoting events in the park and raising income. A three way conversation with the Arts Centre, FTC and the Castle Park Trust was probably the way to go. Ultimately it would be good to see FTC as co-trustee, though there would be a need for thorough due diligence work before any such commitment were taken on. Other possibilities could be a FTC takeover in partnership with CWaC, along the lines of the Neston model; though there were issues around FTC's capacity to manage the building.</p> <p>The CWaC Locality Manager had been asked to consider the business case for these options.</p> <p>Cllr Dawson was keen to get agreement on appointment of a person to take part in the three way dialogue. FTC should take a view on whether they would (later on) be willing to co-fund. And later still, would FTC be willing to be a co-trustee?</p> <p>During discussion the following points were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FTC was already entitled to up to two ex-officio members on the Trust. • FTC was not fully aligned with the trust now – FTC should be at the table. • There was a matter of timing. FTC had struggled in achieving some other short term priorities such as road crossings. Was taking on a potentially large liability such as Castle Park House too much for FTC? We had considered before, though admittedly the house was in better shape now. FTC should be cautious. • The house had been left to the people of Frodsham and the surrounding parishes. This was a good opportunity for FTC to get more closely involved with the running of the House, and in the process becoming a higher quality council. • Arguably FTC needed a permanent home, though that was perhaps a separate question. • Under the Localism Act, many borough councils were devolving responsibility to more local levels and that was the way to go. There was the scope to transfer power to local people and to get local people to do work. <p>It was agreed to nominate Cllrs Pusey and Sutton to be FTC's representatives at all discussions around Castle Park House.</p>
----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

75	CWAC Local Plan	Deferred to next meeting.
76	Planning Applications	
	It should be noted that Borough Councillors voting on planning matters at the Town Council do so on the information currently before them. Their opinion may change if further information is received by the time these matters are considered by the Borough Council.	
76.1	Applications dealt with by Planning Committee	Deferred to next meeting
76.2	Decisions taken by Borough Council	Deferred to next meeting
77	Finance	
77.1	Paid Expenditure – 01.06.14 – 30.06.14	Deferred to next meeting.
77.2	Received Income – 01.06.14 – 30.06.14	Deferred to next meeting.
77.3	Budget Spend & Bank Reconciliation to 30.06.14	Deferred to next meeting.
78	Committees & Work Groups	
78.1	Environment – 08.07.14	Deferred to next meeting.
78.2	Policy & Process – 10.07.14	
	<i>It was agreed to move discussion of Item 93 from part B, under this heading.</i>	
	Cllr Taylor confirmed that staff reviews had been completed. All staff was performing well, sometimes beyond the call of duty. Objectives for 2014-15 had been set and would be reviewed in due course.	
	<i>R1: That FTC does not proceed with the suggestion to twin with Thiviers (see Item 27) Agreed</i>	
	<i>R2: That FTC agrees and adopts all three revised policy documents (see Item 32). Agreed</i>	
	Cllr Taylor asked the Council for retrospective approval for the advertising of the new Service Manager post. Time pressures had made it necessary to act very quickly. It was agreed that the Clerk be empowered to spend within the limits of his mandate under Financial Regulations (£1,000).	
	Cllr Taylor also sought a steer on the Job Description contents: start date and terms and conditions quoted. Feedback was provided.	
	It was agreed that the recruitment process should continue as planned. Interviews would be carried out by a panel of two councillors and the Clerk. The panel would be made up from Cllrs Pusey, Bondi, Warren, Ashton and Taylor, taking into account availability on the required dates. Clerk to organise.	
	Action: Clerk	
78.3	Community – 14.07.14	Deferred to next meeting.
78.4	WW1 Commemorative Group – 16.07.14	
	Cllr Wales reported that rehearsals for the readings at the forthcoming church service were to take place on 1 August at 5.30PM. Service will be held on 3 August.	
	A community scanning event was planned for 2 August	
79	Castle Park House	See above
80	Christmas Festival	See above
81	Structure of Future Agendas	
	The Chairman asked whether the advent of webcams, and the increased desire on the part of the Council to engage with the public argued for different approach to agenda setting. Should more structured public time be allowed for? Might it be possible to compress some matters, for example with Committee Chairs making reports?	
	During discussion the following points were made:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council meetings needed to discharge the Council's business primarily. Public discussion should not get in the way of that. • Agendas could perhaps be more realistic in terms of achievability. • More scope was needed for strategic discussions. • We had just reviewed Standing Orders – any further changes would require further review. • Should we start earlier? Meet twice a month? • Should there be a Frodsham news item at meetings? • Getting people more involved in Committees would help. 	
82	Frodsham Survey	Deferred to a future meeting.
83	CWAC Items	Deferred to next meeting
84	Councillors' Items	
84.1	TRO 865 Sutton Weaver Swing Bridge –Cllr Pusey	See above
84.2	Ship Street – Cllr L Brown & Cllr D Kelly	
	A proposal was made that the process be begun to realise the value of the Ship Street site. A possible eventual outcome might be the sale of the site with development of retirement homes on it (there were other retirement homes nearby). The recent survey indicated support for sale & reinvestment of proceeds.	

84.2 ct'd	<p>The point was made that the site was a strategic one for FTC and consultation would be important with the town. It might be that sale was not the only option – the site could help a vulnerable group perhaps. Rental was a possibility. As was Community Right to Build.</p> <p>Examination of the site by professionals would be important. For example, proximity to Ineos was mentioned. What covenants applied to the land? It was believed these were with CWaC and related to the use of the land for play and recreation.</p> <p>We could await the agreement of the Local Plan – it was likely that we would need more housing. Ship Street might be part of the answer. There was also the need to consider in the context of any Neighbourhood plan. However, delay would be unhelpful and deprive today's children of the benefits of reinvestment of any proceeds in play.</p> <p>It was agreed to take some early steps towards realising the asset – looking at searches, and the covenant in more detail. The Clerk was asked to take forward as soon as possible.</p> <p>Action: Clerk</p>	
85	Consultations	
85.1	Housing Strategy: CWaC Member's Briefing 696	Deferred to next meeting
85.2	Growth & Prosperity: CWaC Member's Briefing 699 - D	Deferred to next meeting
86	Clerk's Report	
	The Clerk confirmed that previously agreed grant payments of £5,000 to St Laurence Church and £8,000 in total to the Youth Association would now be made.	
87	Chairman's Report	Deferred to next meeting.
88	Mayor's Report	Deferred to next meeting.
89	Any Other Matters	Deferred to next meeting.
Part B		
90	London Road Allotments	Brief report provided by Chairman.
91	Park Lane Sale – next steps	Brief report provided by Chairman.
92	Strategy Discussion 23.06.14	Deferred to a future meeting.
<i>Item 93 was moved to Part A by the Chair</i>		
93	Staffing – Town Council Office	See Item 78.2 above

List 1	Planning Decisions Taken by the Unitary Council		
Reference	Address	Description	Decision
14/01931/FU L	10 Lansdale Way	First floor rear ext. & pitched roof to existing porch	PERMIT
14/01557/FU L	Glebe Cottage, Church Road	Single storey side extension with first floor front & rear ext., raising	PERMIT
14/01401/FU L	Weaver Vale PC, Ship Street	Installation of a containerized biomass boiler system	PERMIT

Meeting closed at 10.45 pm.

Town Clerk: Mr Jon Wild
Frodsham Town Council, Castle Park, Frodsham WA6 6SB
Tel: 01928 735150 Email: council@frodsham.gov.uk Website: www.frodsham.gov.uk

Chairs Initials _____