

Council Agenda

Date: Thursday 19th April 2012
Time: 6.00 pm
Venue: Crewe Alexandra Football Club, Gresty Road,
Crewe, CW2 6EB

The agenda is divided into two parts. Part 1 is taken in the presence of the public and press. Part 2 items will be considered in the absence of the public and press for the reasons indicated on the agenda and at the foot of each report.

PART 1 – MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC AND PRESS PRESENT

1. Apologies for Absence

To receive any apologies for absence

2. Minutes of the Meeting Held on 23 February 2012 (Pages 1 - 22)

To approve the minutes as a correct record

3. Public Speaking Time/Open Session

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35 and Appendix 7 to the rules, a total period of 15 minutes is allocated for members of the public to speak at Council meetings.

Individual members of the public may speak for up to 5 minutes, but the Chairman will decide how the period of time allocated for public speaking will be apportioned, where there are a number of speakers.

Members of the public wishing to ask a question at the meeting should provide at least three clear working days' notice in writing and should include the question with that notice. This will enable an informed answer to be given. It is not a requirement to give notice of the intention to make use of public speaking provision. However, as a matter of courtesy, a period of 24 hours notice is encouraged.

4. **Mayor's Announcements**

To receive such announcements as may be made by the Mayor

5. **Declarations of Interest**

To provide an opportunity for Members to declare any personal and/or prejudicial interests in any item on the agenda

6. **Notices of Motion** (Pages 23 - 24)

To consider any Notices of Motion that have been received in accordance with Procedure Rule 12

7. **Recommendation from Constitution Committee - Crewe Community Governance Review** (Pages 25 - 64)

To consider the recommendations of the Constitution Committee

8. **Report Back to Council from Strategic Planning Board re Notice of Motion Sydney Road Bridge, Crewe** (Pages 65 - 70)

To note the decision of the Strategic Planning Board

9. **Election of Mayor and Deputy Mayor for the 2012/13 Civic Year** (Pages 71 - 72)

To designate Councillor G Walton as the Mayor Elect and a second Member as Deputy Mayor Elect, with a view to their formal election as Mayor and Deputy Mayor for Cheshire East for 2012/2013, at the Mayor Making ceremony to be held on 16 May 2012

10. **Questions**

In accordance with Procedure Rules 11, opportunity is provided for Members of the Council to ask the Chairman, the appropriate Cabinet Member or the Chairman of a Committee any question about a matter which the Council, the Cabinet or the Committee has powers, duties or responsibilities.

Questions must be sent in writing to the Monitoring Officer at least 3 clear working days before the meeting.

11. **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

The report relating to the remaining item on the agenda has been withheld from public circulation and deposit pursuant to Section 100(B)(2) of the Local Government Act 1972, on the grounds that the matter may be determined with the press and public excluded.

Council may decide that the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item pursuant to Section 100(A)4 of the Local Government Act 1972, on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information, as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 and public interest would not be served in publishing the information

**PART 2 - MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITHOUT THE PUBLIC AND PRESS
PRESENT**

12. Recommendation from Cabinet - Waste Treatment PFI (Pages 73 - 148)

To consider the recommendation of Cabinet

This page is intentionally left blank

CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the **Council**
held on Thursday, 23rd February, 2012 at Main Hall Congleton Hall -
Congleton Town Hall, High Street, Congleton CW12 1BN

PRESENT

Councillor R West (Chairman)
Councillor G M Walton (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors Rachel Bailey, Rhoda Bailey, A Barratt, G Baxendale, D Bebbington, D Brickhill, D Brown, L Brown, B Burkhill, P Butterill, R Cartlidge, J Clowes, S Corcoran, H Davenport, W S Davies, R Domleo, D Druce, K Edwards, P Edwards, I Faseyi, J P Findlow, W Fitzgerald, R Fletcher, D Flude, H Gaddum, M Grant, P Groves, J Hammond, M Hardy, P Hayes, S Hogben, D Hough, P Hoyland, O Hunter, J Jackson, L Jeuda, M Jones, S Jones, F Keegan, A Kolker, W Livesley, J Macrae, D Mahon, A Martin, M A Martin, P Mason, S McGrory, R Menlove, G Merry, A Moran, B Moran, B Murphy, H Murray, D Neilson, D Newton, P Nurse, M Parsons, P Raynes, L Roberts, J Saunders, M Sherratt, B Silvester, M J Simon, L Smetham, D Stockton, C G Thorley, A Thwaite, D Topping, G Wait, M J Weatherill, P Whiteley and J Wray

Apologies

Councillors C Andrew, G Boston, S Gardiner, L Gilbert, A Harewood, D Marren and S Wilkinson

Note: Councillor D Druce had offered apologies for the morning session and was also absent during consideration of Items 6, 7 and 8.

Note: Councillor P Edwards had offered apologies for the morning session.

82 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 15 DECEMBER 2011**RESOLVED**

That the minutes be approved as a correct record, subject to an amendment to minute 68(9), to state that Honorary Alderman Les Cooper had been Mayor of Crewe and Nantwich in 1996-1997.

83 MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Mayor

1. Informed Members, with sadness, of the recent deaths of former Macclesfield Borough Councillors Barbara Fawkes, who had been Councillor for the Lacey Green Ward in Wilmslow and Brian Reeves,

who had been a Ward Member in Poynton and Cllr David Martin, Town Mayor of Congleton.

2. Informed Members that, after the previous meeting of Council he had received a complaint from a member of the public that some Members were using electronic devices such as Blackberries, Smart phones and iPads during the meeting. He had explained that increasingly Members were using such devices to help them follow the business of Council, however, he requested that Members only use such equipment to help them to follow the proceedings, make notes, or in other ways to assist with their contribution to the meeting.
3. Announced that all Members would shortly be receiving an invitation to a service to be held on the morning of Sunday 22nd April, at St Michael's Church Macclesfield, to celebrate the Diamond Jubilee of Her Majesty the Queen. After the service and with the support of his nominated charity, Age UK Cheshire East, he would be hosting a celebration charity lunch at the Tytherington Club, Macclesfield to which all those attending the service would be warmly invited. This lunch, for which there would be a modest charge, would, for his Mayoral year, replace the now traditional Mayor's Ball. He hoped this would provide an excellent opportunity for the Council to celebrate the almost unique occasion of the Queen's Jubilee and help raise funds for his nominated charity.
4. Announced that, at a previous meeting of the Council, Councillors Flude and Thorley had proposed a Notice of Motion asking the Council to consider erecting a small memorial, in the Crewe area, in recognition of the bravery of six Royal Engineers who were killed by one of four bombs, which fell in a field opposite Alvaston Hall, near Crewe, in August 1940. He was delighted to report that plans for such a memorial were now well advanced and that the management of Alvaston Hall Hotel have agreed for the memorial to be located in their grounds. A very appropriate site had been identified and Officers were working with the Hotel and representatives of the Royal Engineers Association to ensure that a memorial could be constructed later in the year.

(Cllr Flude thanked the officers concerned for their work in respect of the above matter.)

5. Announced that he and the Deputy Mayor had been on many engagements since the last meeting. However, due to the length of the agenda, he did not intend to provide details of them at today's meeting.

84 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Hogben declared a personal interest in item 9 – Local Service Delivery Committees, by virtue of being a Cheshire East allotment holder and in item 13 – Petition for debate Gypsy and traveller site, Coppenhall, Crewe, as he was one of the signatories of the petition.

Councillor Flude declared a personal interest in item 15 (5) – Notice of motion relating to the centenary of the first world war and war memorials in Cheshire East, by virtue of being a member of the Royal British Legion.

Cllr Bebbington declared a personal interest in item 13 – Petition for debate Gypsy and traveller site, Coppenhall, Crewe, as he had been working with the local residents in respect of this issue.

85 PUBLIC SPEAKING TIME/OPEN SESSION - BUDGET ITEMS ONLY

Mrs Charlotte Peters Rock used public speaking time to request that, in view of the rapidly ageing population in Cheshire East and for the good health of the disabled, which put pressure on services, the Council put more funding into the Adult Social care budget when the budget was considered. She highlighted a number of examples where funding had been allocated for other projects in Cheshire East and stated that the Council should focus on vulnerable people and to ensure that the disabled were cared for.

86 REFERRAL TO COUNCIL OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CABINET - BUSINESS PLANNING PROCESS 2012-2015 BUSINESS PLAN

The Cheshire East Council Business Plan for 2012/2015, had been produced following engagement on the Draft Business Plan that was issued in January 2012. The Business Plan had two main elements: the Council's priorities and the Budget. The document set out, in detail, the spending plans and income targets for the financial year starting 1st April 2012, as well as financial estimates for the 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 financial years.

The 2012/2015 Business Plan had been reported to Cabinet on 6th February 2012 and a report which set out the updated position with regard to Government funding levels was now submitted to Council.

When the report was submitted to Cabinet the Local Government Finance Report for 2012/2013 had not been published or confirmed following a debate in the House of Commons. Prior to the Council meeting both of those stages had been completed and confirmed that the formula and specific grant allocations, which had been included in the Business Plan, remained unchanged from the provisional settlement issued in December 2011.

It was noted that the Government consultation on the adjustment made to funding in relation to Academies and the impact on support functions provided by the local authority had not resulted in any changes to the Council's funding for 2012/2013.

It was moved and seconded that

- “1. the updated results of the Budget Engagement exercise undertaken by the Council be noted
2. the comments of the Director of Finance & Business Services (Chief Finance Officer), regarding the robustness of estimates and level of reserves held by the Council based on this budget be noted
3. the Business Plan 2012/2015 be approved
4. the three year Capital Programme for 2012/2013 to 2014/2015 be approved
5. the Band D Council Tax of £1,216.34 be approved
6. the Reserves Strategy be approved
7. the 2012/2013 non ringfenced Specific Grants (excluding DSG) be noted
8. the 2012/2013 Dedicated School Grant (DSG) of £193.8m and the associated policy proposals be agreed
9. the Children and Families Services Portfolio Holder be authorised to agreed any necessary amendment to the DSG position in the light of further information received from DfE, pupil number changes, further academy transfers and the actual balance brought forward from 2011/12
10. the Prudential Indicators for Capital Funding be approved
11. the risk assessment detailed in the report be noted.”

AMENDMENT

The following amendment was moved by Councillor D Flude and seconded by Councillor K Edwards:

Heading, Performance, Customer Services and Capacity, Revenue.

With regard to the review of the Library book fund, which totals £90,000;

The proposed reduction is broken down as follows:

Reference Books £30,000

Adult Lending Books £46,793

Children's Books £13,207

It is proposed that the intended saving of £13,207 in respect of Children's Books be removed from the Business Plan, and the funding be found from the Council's Reserves.

The amendment was carried.

RESOLVED

1. That the updated results of the Budget Engagement exercise undertaken by the Council, as set out in appendix A of the report, be noted.
2. That the comments of the Director of Finance & Business Services (Chief Finance Officer), regarding the robustness of estimates and level of reserves held by the Council based on this budget, as set out in Appendix B of the report, be noted.
3. That, subject to the removal of the intended saving of £13,207 in respect of Children's Books, which was to be found from the Council's reserves, the 2012/2015 Business Plan, as set out in Appendix B of the report, be approved.
4. That the three-year Capital Programme for 2012/2013 to 2014/2015, as set out in Appendix B, Annex 3, paragraphs 88 to 94 and Annex 7 pages 108-116 of the report be approved.
5. That the Band D Council Tax of £1,216.34, as set out in Appendix B, Annex 3, paragraphs 57 to 58 of the report (no change from 2011/2012), be approved.
6. That the Reserves Strategy, as set out in Appendix B, Annex 8 of report be approved.
7. That the 2012/2013 non-ring-fenced Specific Grants (excluding DSG), asset out in Appendix B, Annex 4 of the report be noted.
8. That the 2012/2013 Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) of £193.8m and the associated policy proposals be agreed. (Appendix B, Annex 7, page 89 of the report).
9. That the Children and Family Services Portfolio Holder be authorised to agree any necessary amendment to the DSG position in the light of further information received from DfE, pupil number changes, further academy transfers and the actual balance brought forward from 2011/2012.
10. That the Prudential Indicators for Capital Financing be approved. (Appendix B, Annex 6 of the report).
11. That the risk assessment detailed in Appendix B, Chapter 4 of the report be noted.

87 **PUBLIC SPEAKING TIME/OPEN SESSION - NON BUDGET RELATED ITEMS**

Mr John Jones used public speaking time to ask the following questions and indicated that he would be happy to receive a written response to them :-

1) Regarding the following list of sites:

- Pyms Lane Crewe
- Moss End Farm Alsager
- Leighton West Crewe
- Broad Lane Nantwich
- Walley's green Middlewich Road
- Booth Bed Lane Goostrey
- Holmshaw Lane Haslington
- Hack Green Nantwich

All the above sites are part of much larger Cheshire East Council owned parcels of land.

We would like to know what criteria was used to determine that the sizes as published are the correct sizes in the individual locations?

What person or persons was responsible for deciding these criteria?

Why when the council states that it needs a minimum of 15 pitches at this time are these sites not all of a size that would accommodate this requirement?

2) Where have you drawn your information from regarding your statement "The area is a traditional area for travellers to visit "?

3) Given 5,500 people have signed a petition objecting to this application, what strategy does CEC have in place now, and ongoing, to integrate the two communities? And what cost will this be and how is it to be funded ?

4) From research undertaken Gypsies have stated their order of preference for site provision is as follows : 1) Their personally owned site 2) Site owned by other Gypsy families 3) Council run site. Given this fact, why is Cheshire East forging ahead with this application and in tandem, turning down applications from Gypsies in this County for their own sites ?

5) Given the Council's own research that they require up to 42 pitches in this area in the next 5 years, why have they chosen to site this development on the next to smallest site of their supposed original 12 sites considered which started off as 15 pitches, reduced to 12 and finally to 10 due simply to the site being too small?

The Portfolio Holder, Councillor Rachel Bailey, in response stated:-

“Can I thank Mr Jones for his questions. I am happy to provide a written response to your questions, not only to yourself but also to all members of the Council.”

Ms Judy Collins used public speaking time to speak on behalf of KAFKA, a group which had been formed to fight for local services in Knutsford and which had submitted a petition to be debated later in the meeting. She wished to assure the Council that those who had signed the petition fully understood the position in Knutsford.

She commented that there had been consultation regarding the Stanley Centre, but that there had not been public consultation regarding the temporary closure of Bexton Court. Consultation with GPs was insufficient and more public consultation was needed.

She also took the opportunity to thank the Town Council for their support in this matter.

She stated that, when the petition had been presented the point had been made that Cheshire East Council must lead with its partners and expressed regret that the Council had not taken the opportunity to follow the example of colleagues at Cheshire West and Chester and engage more with interested parties.

88 PETITION FOR DEBATE - GYPSY AND TRAVELLER SITE COPPENHALL CREWE

A petition with 5,543 signatures had been submitted by the CATS Group (Crewe Against Travellers Sites) which read as follows:

“I wish to register my protest against the building of a permanent traveller site at the junction of Parkers Road and Kents Lane in Coppenhall.”

Councillor C Thorley referred to an earlier petition on the matter containing 1,500 signatures.

The petition followed widespread publicity that the Council intended to submit a planning application for a residential Gypsy & Traveller site on land in its ownership. The Petition requested that the matter be debated at a full meeting of the Council and highlighted several reasons against both the principle of providing a site and its provision at this particular location.

The Council's planning application was due to be considered by the Strategic Planning Board.

At the invitation of the Mayor, the Head Petitioner, Mr Perris, addressed the Council meeting. Mr Perris, who was Chairman of the CATS Group, which opposed the current proposal on the grounds of improper use of

taxpayers' money, an improper site selection process, potential traffic hazards, threat to protected wildlife, lack of school facilities and lack of a plan to integrate the travellers into the local community.

Members were afforded the opportunity to ask questions of Mr Perris.

Mrs Roz Buchanan attended the meeting on behalf of Mr Edward Timpson MP and, at the invitation of the Mayor, read out a statement by Mr Timpson in support of the petition.

In considering the petition, Members also had regard to the report of the Strategic Director, Places and Organisational Capacity.

It was moved and seconded that

1. "the Council notes that the planning merits of the proposed site are a matter devolved for consideration by the Strategic Planning Board;
2. in the event that planning permission is granted, Cabinet will consider matters relating to the construction, funding and management of the site."

AMENDMENT

The following amendment was moved and seconded:

"That Cheshire East Council withdraw the planning application and look for an alternative site."

A requisition for a named vote on the amendment was submitted and duly supported in accordance with the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 15.2.

The amendment was put to the meeting with the following results:

For	Against	Abstain
D Bebbington	Rachel Bailey	A Barratt
D Brickhill	Rhoda Bailey	G Baxendale
B Burkhill	J Clowes	D Brown
P Butterill	S Davies	L Brown
R Cartlidge	R Domleo	H Davenport
S Corcoran	D Druce	P Edwards
K Edwards	W Fitzgerald	J P Findlow
I Faseyi	R Fletcher	L Gilbert
D Flude	H Gaddum	J Hammond
M Grant	P Groves	D Hough
M Hardy	P Hoyland	J Jackson
P Hayes	O Hunter	L Jeuda

S Hogben	M Jones	W Livesley
D Mahon	S Jones	B Murphy
P Martin	F Keegan	D Neilson
S McGrory	A Kolker	J Saunders
G Merry	J Macrae	M Sherratt
A Moran	A Martin	B Silvester
D Newton	P Mason	C Thorley
P Nurse	R Menlove	G Walton
M Parsons	B Moran	J Weatherill
L Roberts	H Murray	R West
	P Raynes	J Wray
	M Simon	
	L Smetham	
	D Stockton	
	A Thwaite	
	D Topping	
	G Wait	
	P Whiteley	

The amendment was declared lost, with 22 votes for, 30 against and 23 abstentions.

Members then voted on the substantive motion.

RESOLVED

That

1. The Council notes that the planning merits of the proposed site are a matter devolved for consideration by the Strategic Planning Board; and
2. In the event that planning permission is granted, Cabinet will consider matters relating to the construction, funding and management of the site.

89 PETITION FOR DEBATE - HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE, KNUTSFORD AND THE STANLEY CENTRE IN KNUTSFORD

A petition with 6,290 signatures had been submitted by KAFKA (Knutsford Area for Knutsford Action) which read as follows:

“We the undersigned petition Cheshire East Council and East Cheshire Hospital Trust:

Save our social and health care – keep our services local
 Keep our Stanley Centre for disabled adults
 Return our dementia care services
 Return our intermediate hospital ward”

The petition focused on the overlapping issues concerning the future of health and social care services in Knutsford.

A second petition, which contained 221 signatures, had been forwarded by the East Cheshire NHS Trust and related solely to the Stanley Centre.

At the invitation of the Mayor, the Head Petitioner, Mrs Peters Rock, addressed the Council meeting. She began by expressing concern about the way in which the documents had been dealt with prior to the meeting. She then urged the Council to consider carefully the needs and rights of service users and carers, and questioned whether adequate consultation had taken place with residents of the Knutsford area in respect of social care and health services.

Members were afforded the opportunity to ask questions of Mrs Peters Rock.

In considering the petition, Members also had regard to the report of the Director of Children, Families and Adults.

RESOLVED

That

1. Council accepts the petition presented by KAFKA and acknowledges its content;
2. Council notes the content of this report and the contents of the debate; and
3. The petition be considered by Cabinet at its meeting on 5th March 2012 when it will consider recommendations for the future delivery of adult social care services across the Borough, including Knutsford.

90 REFERRAL TO COUNCIL OF RECOMMENDATION FROM CABINET - TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY 2012 TO 2015, ANNUAL INVESTMENT STRATEGY AND MINIMUM REVENUE PROVISION 2012-2013

Consideration was given to the recommendation from Cabinet to approve the Treasury Management Policy Statement, the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and the Minimum Revenue Provision Statement for 2012/13. The Strategy included the Department for Communities and Local Government reporting requirements, in accordance with the Local Government Investments Guidance under Section 15(1)(a) of the Local Government Act 2003.

RESOLVED

That

1. The Treasury Management Policy Statement, as set out at Appendix A of the report be approved;
2. The Treasury Management Strategy and the Minimum Revenue Provision Statement for 2012/13, as set out in Appendix B of the report be approved; and
3. The Revisions to the Treasury Management Strategy for 2011/12 be approved.

91 COUNCIL TAX 2012/2013 - STATUTORY RESOLUTION

Consideration was given to a report requesting the Council to set the Council Tax for the financial year 2012/2013.

At the time of writing the report, Cheshire Police Authority had not set its budget and its Council Tax precept. A revised report, indicating the Police Authority precept, was tabled at the meeting.

RESOLVED

That Council sets the Council Tax for the financial year 2012/2013, in accordance with the formal resolutions as set out below:

1. That it be noted that on 15th December 2011 the Council calculated the Council Tax base 2012/2013
 - (a) for the whole Council area as 146,807.37.
 - (b) for dwellings in those parts of its area to which a Parish precept relates as in the Appendices attached to the report.
2. That Council calculates that the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2012/2013 (excluding Parish precepts) is £178,567,676.
3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2012/2013 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:
 - a. £715,217,994 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils.
 - b. £532,221, 974 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.

- c. £182,996,020 being the amount by which the aggregate at 19.3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 19.3(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year.
- d. £1,246.50 being the amount at 19.3(c) above divided by the amount at 19.1(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish precepts).
- e. £4,428,344 being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish precepts) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act
- f. £1,216.34 being the amount at 19.3(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 19.3(e) above by the amount at 19.1(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no Parish precept relates.
- g. Appendix A being the amounts calculated by the Council, in accordance with regulations 3 and 6 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992, as its total council tax base for the year and council tax base for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.
- h. Appendix B being the amounts given by adding to the amount at (f) above, the amounts of special items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area mentioned above divided by in each case the appropriate tax base from Appendix A, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 34(3) of the 1992 Act, as the basic amounts of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of the area to which one or more special items relate. (Band D charges for each Parish and Charter Trustees area).
- i. Appendix C being the amounts given by multiplying the amount at (h) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the 1992 Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the 1992 Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands (Local charges for all Bands).

- j. Appendix D being the aggregate of the local charges in (i) above and the amounts levied by major precepting authorities, calculated in accordance with Section 30(2) of the 1992 Act (The total Council Tax charge for each band in each Parish and Charter Trustees area).

92 **REFERRAL TO COUNCIL OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE NOTICE OF MOTION LOCAL SERVICE DELIVERY COMMITTEE**

At the meeting of Council on 15th December 2011, consideration was given to the Constitution Committee's recommendation to approve Terms of Reference for the Local Service Delivery Committees, including membership of the Committees.

Council resolved to refer the matter back to the Constitution Committee for further consideration and requested a report back to the next meeting of the Council.

The Constitution Committee gave further consideration to this matter, at its meeting on 26 January and made further recommendations to Council.

Council gave consideration to the recommendations of the Constitution Committee and:

RESOLVED

That

1. The memberships of the Local Service Delivery Committees for Macclesfield and Crewe be amended to comprise those members who represent the wards in the respective unparished areas; and
2. The revised terms of reference for the Local Service Delivery Committees as set out below be approved, and the Leighton ward be added to the list of wards covered by the Crewe Committee:

"To consider and review the delivery of services and the transfer of assets within the relevant unparished area in accordance with the Council's Policy for Local Service Delivery Arrangements , namely the transfer of assets and the devolution of local services to Town and Parish Councils within the Cheshire East area.

To consider and review the cost implications of both the delivery of services and the transfer of assets within the relevant unparished area in accordance with the Council's Policy for Local Service Delivery arrangements.

To make recommendations to Cabinet on the level of service provision for those services and / or assets being considered as part of the Local Service Delivery arrangements within the relevant unparished area.

To consider and make recommendations to Cabinet on any necessity for, and the amount of, a special expense levy in the relevant unparished area to represent the cost of the Local Service Delivery arrangements and to ensure consistency with the arrangements in the Parished areas.”

93 REFERRAL TO COUNCIL OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE - FINANCE PROCEDURE RULES

The Constitution Committee, at its meeting on 26 January 2012, considered proposed amendments to the Finance and Contract Procedure Rules, which formed part of the Council's Constitution.

The proposed amendments had been endorsed by the Constitution Task Group at its meeting on 16th December 2011. In addition, the Task Group had agreed a number of further amendments, which had been incorporated into the amended Rules.

RESOLVED

That the amended Finance and Contract Procedure Rules, as appended to the report, be approved and the Constitution be amended accordingly.

94 REFERRAL TO COUNCIL OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE CHESHIRE EAST GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS - LOCALISM ACT 2011

Council at its meeting held on 15 December 2011, had referred the following Notice of Motion, submitted by Councillor D Brickhill, to the Constitution Committee for consideration:

‘In view of the obvious and continued failure of the Cabinet system, as evidenced by their inability, for a second year running, to manage their budget, letting it overrun by a predicted £16,000,000, with the resultant reductions of reserves to a dangerously low level, this Council instructs its Constitution Committee to prepare the necessary amendments to bring about a proven successful system of governance, similar to the earlier committee systems of the successful predecessor Councils, to begin from the start of the 2012/13 financial year.’

In order to change governance arrangements, a local authority would be required to pass a resolution at Council. It was anticipated that arrangements could then only be changed with effect from an Annual Council meeting. The precise details of the process were not yet known

and would be contained in regulations to be issued by the Secretary of State.

The Corporate Scrutiny Committee had considered this matter at its meeting on 10th January 2012 and had recommended the appointment of a Joint Member Working Group on a 6:2:1:1 basis to investigate in detail all available options to review governance arrangements under the Localism Act 2011. It was proposed that the Group begin to meet on a provisional basis subject to ratification by Council.

The Constitution Committee had considered this matter at its meeting on 26 January and had resolved that subject to confirmation by Council, and in concurrence with the recommendations of the Corporate Scrutiny Committee,

- (1) a Joint Member Working Group be appointed consisting of 10 Members on a 6:2:1:1 basis, to comprise Members of the Corporate Scrutiny Committee and the Constitution Committee, at least one Member representing the Council's Regulatory Committees and one Member of the Cabinet, with a view to investigating in detail all available options to review governance arrangements under the Localism Act 2011;*
- (2) the Joint Member Working Group meet initially on a provisional basis;*
- (3) appointments to the Joint Member Working Group be pursued through the group whips; and*
- (4) the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Joint Member Working Group be appointed at its first meeting.*

Councillor A Martin reported that the Joint Member Working Group had held its first meeting on 22nd February 2012, and would meet again on 22nd March 2012.

RESOLVED

That the decisions of the Constitution Committee as set out above be confirmed.

95 NOTICES OF MOTION

1. Consideration was given to the following Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor D Brickhill:

"That meetings set out in the Council diary shall not be changed either by timing or location unless:-
All Members have been consulted and there is no relevant business in which case the meeting is cancelled.

All Members are consulted and more than 60 agree to the change.”

The Motion was seconded by Councillor P Edwards.

RESOLVED

That the Motion stand referred to the Constitution Committee.

2. Consideration was given to the following Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor D Brickhill:
 1. “At least 80% of all money raised by community levy payments by Developers must be spent in the same town or parish council area as the actual development.
 2. The remaining 20%, if any, must be spent in the same district as the actual development, where ‘district’ means the appropriate area of one of the three previous district councils that made up Cheshire East.
 3. The planning department shall consult the parish or town council on how the money should be spent and, if necessary, fully explain at a planning Committee meeting why the parish’s recommendations cannot be implemented.
 4. The planning department shall provide to the parish or town council full accounts on how the money was spent.”

The Motion was seconded by Councillor A Moran.

RESOLVED

That the Motion stand referred to the Strategic Planning Board.

3. Consideration was given to the following Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor S Corcoran:

“This Council thanks the Leader for sharing his thoughts at the last council meeting on whether Councillor allowances should be increased to replace mileage rates. However, this council does not support the idea because:

1. It would disadvantage councillors in outlying areas.
2. It would disadvantage active Councillors who travel frequently to attend meetings and reward councillors who do not attend many meetings.
3. At a time when public opinion of payments to MPs and councillors is highly sceptical, the public perception might be

that this is a ruse to bring in an increase in allowances through the back door.”

The Motion was seconded by Councillor K Edwards.

RESOLVED

That the Motion stand referred to the Independent Remuneration Panel.

4. Consideration was given to the following Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor S Hogben:

“Coppenhall East Crewe

No large scale housing plans in Coppenhall East should be approved or signed off until essential improvements to the road bridge over the Crewe to Manchester railway line on Sydney Road, as well as the northern relief road from Crewe Green roundabout to the A530 Middlewich Road, have been approved.”

The Motion was seconded by Councillor R Cartlidge.

RESOLVED

That the Motion stand referred to the Strategic Planning Board.

5. Consideration was given to the following Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor D Flude:

“Centenary of the First World War and War Memorials Cheshire East

In 2014 the nation will commemorate the centenary of the First World War can this council be assured that any war memorials that the borough has responsibility for are being conserved to the high standard that the public expect?

Is there a comprehensive list of all memorials in the borough’s keeping?

Are all memorials in good repair?

Is the budget sufficient for the conservation of the memorials for generations to come?

A report to the relevant Scrutiny committee is prepared to inform members in relation to the points above.

Can this council consider how it will plan for the centenary events in 2014 to include the Cheshire Archives, the museum of Cheshire

Regiment, other military, Cheshire's many history societies our libraries, schools and residents?"

The Motion was seconded by R Cartlidge.

RESOLVED

That the Motion stand referred to the Cabinet.

6. Consideration was given to the following Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor H Gaddum:

"With regard to funding for education:

Cheshire East Council resolves that:

- MPs are thanked for bringing these issues to the Government's attention.
- The Department have undertaken several consultations with Local Authorities during the last 12 months. Cheshire East welcomes the Government's commitment to reviewing schools funding methodology.
- Cheshire East are supportive of an approach which provides a more equitable level of funding for all Local Authorities and all children nationally.
- The Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) for Cheshire East is well below the national average and below the grant provided to many similar Local Authorities. In April 2009, Cheshire County Council was split into two separate Authorities, Cheshire East and West. If funded at the same rate as Cheshire West, Cheshire East would receive an additional £10m of funding. The reasons for this disparity are not clear.

Cheshire East also calls on the Government to:-

- Develop a properly designed funding methodology to address conversions to academies. It is essential that the share of retained budgets given to academies is realistic and calculated under a sound basis. The reduction in formula grant to reflect academy conversions is not appropriate, particularly as there is no clear basis on which such deductions have been made. The calculation of Local Authority Central Spend Equivalent Grant should be done in such a way as to not financially disadvantage those schools that choose to remain as part of the Local Authority.
- Recognise concerns in respect of FSM as a measure for deprivation. Areas of deprivation can be quite dramatic, whereas pockets of deprivation can be quite local and severe. Free School Meals is considered too blunt a measure.

- Use recent consultation responses to address national inconsistencies in funding. This is the main issue for Local Authorities and schools, rather than how funding is passed out.

Cheshire East Council resolves to support the appended draft letter to the Secretary of State for Education.”

The Motion was seconded by Councillor Rhoda Bailey.

The Motion was a matter for the Council.

RESOLVED

That it is agreed unanimously that the Motion be approved in full.

7. Consideration was given to the following Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor L Jeuda:

“Health and Social Care Bill

This Council urges Cheshire East MPs to vote against the Health and Social Care Bill when it returns to the House of Commons.

There is no democratic mandate for this reorganization. It was ruled out in the Coalition Agreement and in every reference to the NHS by the leader of the Conservative Party, at the time of the General Election. He referred to no top down reorganization, we did not vote for this!

The NHS was set up in 1948 with a vision of what could be possible in relation to future health care, as well as what was achievable at the time.

The Coalition Government’s Health and Social Care Bill strikes at the heart of that vision.

Everyone acknowledges that the NHS must constantly evolve, which is what it has been doing for the past 63 years.

It is scandalous that the Government is setting aside £3.5bn on an unnecessary reorganization when the NHS is facing the biggest challenge in its history. It has to save £20bn over the next four years, Central and Eastern Cheshire PCT has set aside £27,898,799.

The Bill has so far has over 100 amendments the Bill proposes major structural re-organisation, with 49% of NHS beds moving to the private sector. We acknowledge that there is an important role for the private sector.

Professional bodies that are not politically aligned and represent the full spectrum of health service workers have voted to advocate dropping

the Health and Social Care Bill - notably the British Medical Association, Royal Colleges of Nursing, Midwifery, General Practitioner's, Radiographers and Radiologists, the Chartered Society of Physiotherapists, the Patients' Association and the NHS Consultants' Association. Other professional bodies such as the Royal Colleges of Psychiatrists, Pathologists and Ophthalmologists and the Faculty for Public Health have pointed out serious flaws in the Bill. Furthermore, citizens have concerns and in some cases fear about the damage that the proposed changes may do to the NHS, with direct impact on services in the future for them and their families.

It is time to be looking at a 'Plan B' for the NHS."

The Motion was seconded by Councillor J Jackson.

RESOLVED

That the Motion stand referred to the Cabinet.

96 SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES - QUARTER THREE REVIEW

Consideration was given to a report bringing forward Cabinet recommendations for Supplementary Estimates contained within the 2011/12 Quarter Three Review of Performance report for Council approval as follows:

- a Supplementary Revenue Estimate of £0.6m to be met from general reserves to meet one-off Voluntary Redundancy costs in 2011/12, as detailed in Appendix 1 of the report.
- a Supplementary Capital Estimate / Virement of over £1,000,000 for Crewe Rail Exchange, as detailed in Appendix 2 of the report.

RESOLVED

That the above supplementary estimates be approved.

97 LEADER'S REPORT TO FULL COUNCIL

The Leader announced the appointment of Councillor Janet Clowes as the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing and Councillor Stewart Gardiner as Cabinet Support Member for Health and Wellbeing.

The Leader also made a statement in respect of his recent announcement regarding his resignation as Leader of the Council and thanked Members of all parties for their support during his time as Leader.

98 APPOINTMENT OF A VICE CHAIRMEN TO THE AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

Consideration was given to the appointment of a Vice-Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee in place of Councillor M Hardy who had resigned from the position due to work commitments.

RESOLVED

That Councillor D Marren be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee.

99 CHESHIRE EAST PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2012/13

Consideration was given to a report regarding the requirement for local authorities to produce a Pay Policy Statement for 2012/2013 by 31st March 2012 and for each financial year thereafter under Section 38/11 of the Localism Act 2011.

The report had been considered by the Staffing Committee at its meeting on 20th February 2012. The Committee had recommended that the Pay Policy Statement be approved.

The Pay Policy Statement being recommended for adoption was attached at Appendix A of the report.

RESOLVED

That the Pay Policy Statement 2012/13 be approved.

100 QUESTIONS

The following question had been submitted in accordance with Procedure Rule 11:

Question from Councillor K Edwards to the Leader of the Council

Lyme Green Waste Transfer Station

While welcoming the very full and frank apology made to residents and taxpayers in Cheshire East from the leader of the Council, Councillor Wesley Fitzgerald, with regard to the waste of up to £560,000 in relation to a possible waste disposal site at Lyme Green on the outskirts of Macclesfield, will the Leader please ensure that the appropriate Cabinet Member requests the Environment and Prosperity Scrutiny Committee to examine the reasons why the withdrawal of the planning application had to take place meaning that up to £560,000 worth of investment in site preparation at Lyme Green has been wasted?

Will he make as part of that request an insistence that the Scrutiny Committee should make recommendations as to how such a situation can be avoided in the future and will he ensure that the report comes back for consideration at a future Council Meeting of Cheshire East so Members can be assured there will be no repeat of such an appalling waste of public and taxpayers money in the future?

Response

The Audit and Governance Committee is already supporting an internal investigation which has been instigated by the Chief Executive into the series of events that have led to the concerns expressed by Councillor Edwards.

The investigation is being carried out by the Council's internal audit section over a period of weeks. It will look at the process which led to the regrettable situation and will include a detailed investigation of the finances.

The results of the investigation will be thoroughly looked at to ensure that lessons can be learnt and that changes to mitigate such an occurrence in the future are put in place.

A summary of the investigation will be published at a date to be confirmed.

The meeting commenced at 10.00 am and concluded at 5.25 pm

Councillor R West (Chairman)
CHAIRMAN

COUNCIL – 19 APRIL 2012**NOTICES OF MOTION****1. Submitted by Councillor D Brickhill****M6/A500 Junction**

The Chief Executive of this Council be instructed to write immediately to the Highways Minister, and to local MPs, expressing this Council's concern in the strongest possible terms at any further delay in addressing the need for remedial works to ease the serious congestion at Junction 16 of the M6 and seeking an assurance that works can commence to the M6/A 500 junction before the end of 2012.

2. Submitted by Councillors L Jeuda and J Jackson**Adult Social Care**

Recent research carried out nationally by Which? into the domiciliary care people received at home found that many received a poor service. The results from the survey revealed shocking examples of neglect and a lack of respect by the care providers towards the people they were meant to be caring for. This follows a disturbing report published by the Equality and Human Rights Commission in November 2011, which found that the Human Rights of older people were being denied by a poor level of care and a lack of respect.

In the Which? report an improved service was received only after complaints had been made. Only four in ten people knew how to complain if they were not satisfied with the service provided.

Motion

1. This Council will ensure that policies are in place to prevent this happening to people in receipt of domiciliary care living in Cheshire East and that all Customers are provided with a copy of the relevant Complaints Procedure.
2. That Council ask Cabinet to request that the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee consider the findings from both the reports and re-examine the quality of services provided, including the Complaints Procedure, and how Cheshire East Commissioning Strategy deals with the issues raised.

3. Submitted by Councillors K Edwards and D Flude**Culture Policy**

As Unitary Councils can and should be a powerful support to the sense of community in the area for which they have responsibility, Cheshire East Council will develop a cultural policy, that will support the rich ancient and industrial heritage of the borough, encourage the enjoyment of and the participation in the creative and performing arts and ensure a full range of facilities to enable residents to experience and enjoy a rich cultural life.

4. Submitted by Councillors D Bebbington and M Jones

Parkers Road, Crewe Proposed Gypsy and Traveller Site

Cheshire East Council's Conservative Group acknowledges the new Planning Policy for Gypsy and Traveller sites and the new National Planning Policy Framework announced by Government last week.

As a consequence of the new guidelines, Council is asked to resolve that the Parkers Road planning application should be withdrawn and that a further assessment of need should be undertaken and considered as part of the Local Plan process.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Wesley Fitzgerald, should be thanked for aggressively pursuing a change of policy which places the destiny of gypsies and travellers in the hands of Members.

5. Submitted by Councillor G Boston

Response Time for Elected Members Enquires

Elected Members as the representatives of local people often need to contact Cheshire East staff for information/explanation of particular actions, or as is more often the case inactions.

Recent experience is that officers are sometimes taking as long as three weeks to respond to enquiries made by Elected Members. Whilst that timescale is clearly unacceptable there isn't actually a protocol laid down for what is an acceptable response time to Elected Members. Following discussion with senior officers of this Authority we are told that the acceptable timescale for a response to an Elected Member is the same as the general public which is five days.

The Labour Group's view is that we are not members of the public but their elected representatives; furthermore we are almost always making an enquiry when for whatever reason the customer response protocols have broken down.

Other authorities have specific response times for elected member enquiries for example Manchester City Council has 24hrs with a clear expectation on officers that responding to elected members is a top priority.

On behalf of the Labour group I move that Cheshire East Council adopt a policy of responding to elected member enquiries within 2 working days even if that response is a holding reply pending the collection of further information.

COUNCIL MEETING – 19TH APRIL 2012**Extract from the Minutes of the Constitution Committee Meeting on 22nd March 2012****54 CREWE COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW**

The Committee considered the recommendations of the Community Governance Review Sub-Committee following the outcome of the Stage 1 consultation with a view to advising Council on the formulation of its draft recommendation.

The Committee had before it the papers considered by the Sub-Committee at its meeting on 13th March 2012. These comprised:

- a briefing paper based on the statutory guidance issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government which set out the process to be followed in conducting the Community Governance Review and the matters to be taken into consideration by the Council in formulating a draft recommendation;
- the outcome of the ballot of local electors held in February; and
- other representations received from the public and stakeholders during the first round of consultation.

The initial phase of consultation had included written representations received in response to public notices, specific invitations, a website tool and information leaflets. Two public meetings had been held in September to give members of the public the opportunity to learn more about the review and to express their views in a public forum. Further opportunities had subsequently been provided to provide information at various community events during November and December 2011. The Council's website had also been used as a source of information and as a tool for people to use to record their views. Finally, a voting paper had been sent to electors in Crewe to be returned by 29th February.

The ballot of local electors had taken place throughout the month of February 2012 and the result showed 10,810 electors in favour of a single town council for Crewe and 1,390 against. The vote represented a 32% turnout and the Sub-Committee was satisfied that this was sufficient to represent the views of the electors of Crewe. Other public and stakeholder responses made during the Stage 1 consultation also showed a clear preference for a single town council.

The Sub-Committee had also considered the electoral and warding arrangements for the parish council, including the numbers and disposition of wards, number of parish councillors, date of elections and transitional arrangements, details of which were set out in the minutes of the Sub-Committee's meeting.

The Sub-Committee had recommended as follows:

“That the Constitution Committee be advised that pursuant to Section 87 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007; and having regard to the provisions of the Department for Communities and Local Government and Electoral Commission Guidance, issued in April 2008, for the conduct of Community Governance Reviews:

1. Having taken into account

- a. the results of the consultation with the electors of the unparished area of Crewe which shows that a majority of those who returned their ballot papers were in favour of a new parish council for their area;
- b. the results of the consultation exercise with stakeholders and the representations from other interested persons;
- c. the outcomes of the public meetings held in Crewe and subsequent publicity and consultation arrangements; and
- d. the information on existing community governance arrangements in the area concerned and the alternative forms of community governance which might have been appropriate for the area in question;

2. Council be advised

- a. that the interests of effective and convenient local government and community identities in the area would be served by the creation of a new parish with a parish council for the unparished area of Crewe and that parish council be advised to consider its designation as a Town Council;
- b. that the parish should be divided into 6 wards for the purposes of election to the Parish Council, such wards to be coterminous with the existing Borough wards except that the unparished part of Leighton (Polling District 3FJ5) be incorporated into the St Barnabas parish ward, and that each ward should have the same number of parish councillors as Borough Councillors as follows:

St Barnabas (inc part of Leighton)	1
Crewe Central	1
Crewe North	1
Crewe South	2
Crewe East	3
Crewe West	2
TOTAL	10

- c. that the first year of elections to the new parish council should be 2015;
- d. that in the intervening period, as soon as the community review governance process allows, a temporary parish council be

appointed by the Borough Council, to comprise the members of the Crewe Local Service Delivery Committee; and

- e. that these proposals form the basis of a second stage of public consultations and that the Boundary Commission be informed of these proposals.”

In noting the advice of the Sub-Committee, the Committee considered a number of issues:

1. whether the electors of the unparished part of Leighton should be asked if they wished to be included in the proposed parish of Crewe or in the existing parish of Leighton;
2. whether the proposed number of 10 parish councillors for Crewe was sufficient for a town of that size, given that a number of smaller towns in Cheshire East, such as Nantwich, Congleton, Alsager and Wilmslow, had a larger number of town councillors; and
3. whether it was appropriate to delay parish elections until 2015 and to appoint a temporary parish council when elections could be held in May 2013.

RESOLVED

That pursuant to Section 87 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007; and having regard to the provisions of the Department for Communities and Local Government and Electoral Commission Guidance, issued in April 2008, for the conduct of Community Governance Reviews:

1. the Committee having taken into account
 - a. the results of the consultation with the electors of the unparished area of Crewe which shows that a majority of those who returned their ballot papers were in favour of a new parish council for their area;
 - b. the results of the consultation exercise with stakeholders and the representations from other interested persons;
 - c. the outcomes of the public meetings held in Crewe and subsequent publicity and consultation arrangements;
 - d. the information on existing community governance arrangements in the area concerned and the alternative forms of community governance which might have been appropriate for the area in question; and
 - e. the advice of the Community Governance Review Sub-Committee;

2. Council be advised

- a. that the interests of effective and convenient local government and community identities in the area would be served by the creation of a new parish with a parish council for the unparished area of Crewe and that parish council be advised to consider its designation as a Town Council;
- b. that the parish should be divided into 6 wards for the purposes of election to the Parish Council, such wards to be coterminous with the existing Borough wards except that, subject to recommendation c. below, the unparished part of Leighton (Polling District 3FJ5) be incorporated into the St Barnabas parish ward, and that each ward should have the number of parish councillors as follows:

St Barnabas	2
Crewe Central	2
Crewe North	2
Crewe South	3
Crewe East	4
Crewe West	3
TOTAL	16

- c. that the electors of the unparished part of the Borough ward of Leighton should be asked whether they would prefer to be included within the proposed parish of Crewe or within the existing parish of Leighton;
- d. that elections to the Crewe parish council should be held as soon as is practicably possible, thereafter to be synchronised with the ordinary date of parish council elections; and
- e. that these proposals form the basis of a second stage of public consultation and that the Boundary Commission be informed of the proposals.

CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL

COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW SUB COMMITTEE

Date of Meeting:	13 March 2012
Report of:	Borough Solicitor
Subject/Title:	Crewe Community Governance Review – Formulating The Council's Draft Recommendation

1. Report Summary

1. This paper provides members with an outline of the process to be followed in conducting this review. It is based on the statutory guidance in respect of the process for creating a new local council 'Guidance on community governance reviews' issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government and the Electoral Commission.

2. Procedure

1. Since February 2008 the power to take decisions about matters such as the creation of parishes and their electoral arrangements has been devolved from the Secretary of State and the Electoral Commission to principal Councils such as Cheshire East Council.
2. Cheshire East Council can, therefore, decide whether to give effect to the recommendations made arising from the Community Governance Review, provided it takes the views of local people into account.
3. In broad terms the process will follow a number of phases outlined below:
 - Determine viable options for community governance in the area under review.
 - Draw up a Consultation Plan focused on consulting on those viable options.
 - Stage 1 Consultation on the options.
 - Evaluation and analysis of responses.
 - Draft recommendation for the Constitution Committee to consider for recommendation to Council.
 - Draft Proposal advertised
 - Stage 2 Consultation on the Draft Proposal
 - Council decides Outcome of the review.

4. The key element of the Review is the consultation process. The Sub Committee agreed the list of consultees, method of consultation and the timing of the consultation process.
5. The consultation process is central to the Review and must include:
 - Local government electors in the area under review
 - Local businesses, local public and voluntary organisations, schools, health bodies
 - Residents and community groups
 - Area working arrangements.
6. The initial phase of consultation has been based largely on written representations received in response to public notices, specific invitations, a website tool and information leaflets. Two public meetings were held in September to give members of the public the opportunity to learn more about the review and to express their views in a public forum. As these were poorly attended, further opportunities were subsequently provided to provide information at various community events during November and December 2011. An exhibition display was also located on various days at the Crewe Market, Crewe Library and Delamere House. A communications plan was also developed to support the consultation which comprised of seven press releases, an article in the partnership newsletter, an advert in the programme for a fixture at the Crewe Alexandra Football ground and information on the plasma screens at the customer centre. A voting paper was also sent to electors in Crewe which were required to be returned by 29 February. The website has also been used as a source of information and as a tool for people to use to record their views. A link has been included on the front page of the website during the course of the consultation period.

3. Criteria when undertaking a Review

1. The Council now needs to consider the results of the initial phase of consultation and formulate recommendations ensuring that community governance within the area under review will be
 - Reflective of the identities and interests of the community in that area
 - Effective and convenient
2. Key considerations in meeting the criteria include:
 - The impact of community governance arrangements on community cohesion
 - The size, population and boundaries of a local community or parish
 - Parishes should reflect distinctive and recognisable communities of interest with their own sense of identity
 - The degree to which the proposals offer a sense of place and identity for all residents
 - The ability of the proposed authority's ability to deliver quality services economically and efficiently providing users with a democratic voice

- The degree to which a town/ parish council would be viable in terms of a unit of local government providing at least some local services that are convenient, easy to reach and accessible to local people.

4. Recommendations and Decisions on the Review Outcome

1. The guidance requires that recommendations must be made with respect to the following:
 - a) Whether a new parish or any new parishes should be constituted
 - b) The name of any new parish
 - c) Whether or not the new parish should have a parish council (if the parish has more than 1000 electors, the review must recommend that the parish should have a parish council)
 - d) What the electoral arrangements for new parishes which are to have parish councils should be
2. These recommendations must have regard to:
 - The need to ensure that community governance reflects the identities and interests of the community in the area and is effective and convenient
 - Any other arrangements that have already been made for the purposes of community representation or engagement
 - Any representations received and should be supported by evidence which demonstrates that the community governance arrangements would meet the criteria.
3. It should be noted that Cheshire East Council can only establish a parish council, but could recommend that it should be given the title of a Town Council. The decision whether to be called a Town Council or not would be one for any new parish council established to consider and determine.

5. Electoral Arrangements

1. The Review must give consideration to the electoral arrangements that should apply in the event that a parish council is established. In particular the following must be considered:
 - a) The ordinary year of election – if a single parish council were established, the elections would take place every four years. The next scheduled parish council elections are in May 2015. Should a decision be made to establish a parish council before that date, Councillors would be elected on the same basis as a by-election i.e. their term of office would expire in May 2015, rather than being in office for a full four year term.

- b) The Council can also consider whether to put a “temporary parish council” in place for a period of time before elections are held. The authority can choose anybody it wants to sit on the body and usually it will appoint at least one ward councillor. Temporary parish councils have all the legal powers of an elected parish council, so they can appoint a clerk or other staff, exercise powers and provide services. In the case of a decision being made to hold elections relatively quickly, councils would not normally deem it necessary to put such temporary arrangements in place.
- c) Council size – the number of councillors to be elected to the parish
- d) Parish warding – whether the parish should be divided into wards; this includes the number and boundaries of such wards; number of councillors per ward and the names of wards. In considering whether to recommend that a parish should or should not be warded, the council should consider:-
 - whether the number or distribution of electors would make a single election of councillors impractical or inconvenient;
 - whether it is desirable that any area of the parish should be separately represented on the council

If the Council decides to recommend wards – in considering the size and boundaries of the wards and the number of Councillors for the wards it must have regard to the following factors:

- i) the number of electors for the parish
- ii) any change in number / distribution of electors likely to occur in period of 5 years
- iii) desirability of fixing boundaries which will remain easily identifiable
- iv) any local ties which will be broken by the fixing of any particular boundaries

6. Council Size

1. The Local Government Act 1972 Act specifies that each parish council must have at least 5 members; there is no maximum number. There are no rules relating to the allocation of those Councillors between parish wards.
2. There is a wide variation of council size between parish councils. Research in 1992 has shown this is influenced by population:
 - Between 2501 and 10,000 population had 9 to 16 councillors
 - Between 10,001 and 20,000 population had 13 to 37 councillors
 - Almost all over 20,000 population had between 13 and 31 councillors.
3. The National Association of Local Councils suggests that the minimum number of councillors for any parish should be 7 and the maximum 25.

4. Each area should be considered on its own merits, having regard to population, geography and patterns of communities. Principal councils should bear in mind that the conduct of parish business does not usually require a large body of councillors. However, a parish council's budget and planned level of service provision may be important factors in reaching a decision on Council size.

7. Parish warding and names of wards

1. There is likely to be a stronger case for the warding of urban areas. In urban areas community identity tends to focus upon a locality, with its own sense of identity. In terms of naming parish wards consideration should be given to existing local or historic places, so that these are reflected where appropriate. The Council should take account of community identity and interests and consider whether any ties or linkages would be broken by the drawing of particular ward boundaries.
Also, when considering ward boundaries the Council should consider the desirability of fixing boundaries which will remain easily identifiable.

8. Number of Councillors to be elected for parish wards

1. If the council decides that a parish should be warded, it should give consideration to the levels of representation between each ward. It is best practice for each persons vote should be of equal weight as far as possible.

9. Other forms of Community Governance

1. In conducting the Community Governance Review, the Council must consider other forms of community governance as alternatives to establishing parish councils, for example:

1. Area Committees
2. Neighbourhood management
3. Tenant Management Organisations
4. Area/ community forums
5. Residents/ Tenants organisations
6. Community Associations

The Sub Committee has included these options as part of the consultation process and no support has been demonstrated for any of these alternative options. The Sub Committee also received a report from the LAP Manager in September 2011 on existing community governance arrangements in Crewe.

10. RECOMMENDATION

In summary, in forming a draft recommendation for the Community Governance Review, the Sub Committee needs to have regard to all representations received, and consider and recommend to the Constitution Committee:

- a. Any forms of community governance as alternatives to establishing parish councils, for example:
- Area Committees
 - Neighbourhood management
 - Tenant Management Organisations
 - Area/ community forums
 - Residents/ Tenants organisations
 - Community Associations
- b. Whether a new parish or any new parishes should be constituted
- c. The name of any new parish or parishes
- d. Whether or not the new parish should have a parish council (if the parish has more than 1000 electors, the review must recommend that the parish should have a parish council)
- e. Whether the parish should have an alternative Style e.g. Community, Neighbourhood, or Village; or whether the status of Town Council should be recommended
- f. What the electoral arrangements for new parishes which are to have parish councils should be
- g. The ordinary year of election
- h. Council size – the number of councillors to be elected to the parish
- i. Parish warding – whether the parish should be divided into wards; this includes the number and boundaries of such wards; number of councillors per ward and the names of wards.

Officer Contact Details

Name: Lindsey Parton
Designation: Registration Service and Business Support Manager
Tel No: 01270 686477
Email: lindsey.parton@cheshireeast.gov.uk

Daily Returns

Date	Crewe (Without Leighton)		37,344		Leighton (1F14)		406		Total		37,750	
	Daily	Total	Turnout		Daily	Total	Turnout		Daily	Total	Turnout	
Friday 03/02/12	9	9	0.02%		0	0	0.00%		9	9	0.02%	
Monday 06/02/12	4,933	4,942	13.23%		2	2	0.49%		4,935	4,944	13.10%	
Tuesday 07/02/12	52	4,994	13.37%		0	2	0.49%		52	4,996	13.23%	
Wednesday 08/02/12	1,873	6,867	18.39%		23	25	6.16%		1,896	6,892	18.26%	
Thursday 09/02/12	914	7,781	20.84%		12	37	9.11%		926	7,818	20.71%	
Friday 10/02/12	976	8,757	23.45%		9	46	11.33%		985	8,803	23.32%	
Monday 13/02/12	1,143	9,900	26.51%		12	58	14.29%		1,155	9,958	26.38%	
Tuesday 14/02/12	10	9,910	26.54%		0	58	14.29%		10	9,968	26.41%	
Wednesday 15/02/12	502	10,412	27.88%		3	61	15.02%		505	10,473	27.74%	
Thursday 16/02/12	260	10,672	28.58%		2	63	15.52%		262	10,735	28.44%	
Friday 17/02/12	332	11,004	29.47%		4	67	16.50%		336	11,071	29.33%	
Monday 20/02/12	229	11,233	30.08%		2	69	17.00%		231	11,302	29.94%	
Tuesday 21/02/12	124	11,357	30.41%		1	70	17.24%		125	11,427	30.27%	
Wednesday 22/02/12	83	11,440	30.63%		1	71	17.49%		84	11,511	30.49%	
Thursday 23/02/12	218	11,658	31.22%		2	73	17.98%		220	11,731	31.08%	
Friday 24/02/12	24	11,682	31.28%		0	73	17.98%		24	11,755	31.14%	
Monday 27/02/12	233	11,915	31.91%		4	77	18.97%		237	11,992	31.77%	
Tuesday 28/02/12	98	12,013	32.17%		1	78	19.21%		99	12,091	32.03%	
Wednesday 29/02/12	122	12,135	32.50%		0	78	19.21%		122	12,213	32.35%	

This page is intentionally left blank

Final Results

Area	No of voting papers received	Yes	No	Rejected	Total	Do totals match?
Crewe	12,135	10,741	1,381	13	12,135	YES
Leighton (1FJ4)	78	69	9	0	78	YES
TOTALS	12,213	10,810	1,390	13	12,213	YES

This page is intentionally left blank

Crewe Community Governance Review Sub Committee
13 March 2012

Summary of Representations Received

1. The following feedback was received in response to the Stage 1 consultation undertaken between 14 November and 16 December and was reported to the Sub Committee at its meeting on 20 December, together with a copy of each representation received.

	Responses received by Registration Service and Business Manager (as at Monday 19 December 2011)	Hardcopy responses received by LAP Manager at consultation events (as at Tuesday 20 December 2011)	Totals
Town / Parish Council	37	15	52
Town /Parish Council and Community Association	1	-	1
Parish Council and Community Forum	1	-	1
Town / Parish Council and Neighbourhood Management	-	1	1
Supports concept of subsidiarity	1	-	1
No change	1	-	1
No preference expressed	4	1	5
Total	45	17	62

87% of respondents support a Town / Parish Council as their highest preference.

2. The following representations in support of and against a Single Town Council for Crewe have been received since 16th December, copies of which are attached. 10 further communications were received which have not been included in the summary as they are seeking further information before completing and returning their ballot paper. Further correspondence was also received from some people indicating that they had not received their ballot paper. In many cases this was because people were residents of an area of Crewe which was already parished, and would not therefore have been sent a ballot paper. In

those cases where a ballot paper should clearly have been received, people were encouraged to submit their views by letter or by email.

34x Representations Received since 16 December 2011 in Support of a Single Town Council for Crewe	
A1	Jack Wimpenny, Chair of Governors, St Mary's Primary School
A2	Mrs Stephenson
A3	Andrew Brown
A4	Lenka MolCanova & Jason Bennett
A5	Mr C Nicholson
A6	Malcolm Riley, Deacon of Union Street Baptist Church
A7	Mr & Mrs Corbett
A8	Andrew Dixon
A9	Andrew Taylor, Minister of Union Street Baptist Church
A10	David Elliott
A11	D Harrison
A12	P A Harrison
A13	Unsigned letter of support
A14	Petition signed by 14 residents of Coleridge Way, Crewe
A15	Ballot paper received and not included in the summary of voting papers returned
A16	Ballot paper received and not included in the summary of voting papers returned
A17	Unofficial ballot paper received and not included in the summary of voting papers returned
A18	Ballot paper received and not included in the summary of voting papers returned
A19	Ballot paper received and not included in the summary of voting papers returned
A20	Nigel Parton

4 x Representations Received since 16 December 2011 against a Single Town Council for Crewe	
B1	Hassall
B2	P & M Eustance
B3	T J Stubbs

1x Representations Received since 16 December 2011 concerning the consultation process	
C1	David Perry

PARTON, Lindsey

From: Jack Wimpenny [jack.wimpenny@tiscali.co.uk]
Sent: 19 December 2011 20:33
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: Crewe Community Governance Review

Dear Sir,

Thank you for asking me to take part in this consultation and I apologise for my late submission.

I welcome the clear description of the various options for Crewe. After considering these, my view is that Crewe should have its own, elected Town Council.

The cabinet system of governance adopted by Cheshire East can result in few, if any, of Crewe Councillors being in a position to represent their town at the highest level of decision making. As funding for Local Government tightens, the allocation of money for Crewe's local needs may thus be compromised.

Things important to Crewe residents are likely to be of little significance to those of other towns. I can think of Crewe Park as an example. Funding shortages appear to have left the park without sufficient daily supervision, compromising the benefits of the recent renovation work. Crewe residents might consider this an area in which they would like to invest more resources.

Responsibility goes hand-in-hand with authority. Of the options suggested in your consultation document, the elected Town Council is the only structure that links responsibility for service delivery with authority mandated to them by the local electorate. In your own words, 'Parish/Town Councils are arguably the most local form of government'. All the other options lack either a true mandate from the local electorate and/or the ability to raise money independently.

I feel that 'fairness' is lacking in the present arrangements. Towns fortunate to have a Town/Parish Council at the time of Cheshire East's formation have benefitted from almost three years in which their local agenda has been able to move forward. As far as I am aware, this has been achieved alongside and at no detriment to the progress of Cheshire East's plans or policies.

At St Mary's Primary School, we teach that everyone should have a voice and that voice has a right to be heard. An elected Town Council for Crewe would give residents more of a voice in the services that affect their lives locally and the means to put ideas into action.

Yours faithfully,

Jack Wimpenny,

Chair of Governors,

St Mary's primary School, Crewe.

Friday

MRS. L. STEPHENSON.
FLAT 8, ELM COURT,
ON, ELM DRIVE,
CREWE, CHESHIRE.

Dear Sir,

Yes, I would like to know
what a difference it will make
to have a Single Town Council
here in Crewe?

Page 42

Our town has gone down so much
we wonder if it will ever be put
upright? Because it has really gone
down these days.

I am pleased to say that the Quebec
East Council have been very good
& helpful with me, of which I am
very grateful. At 90 yrs of age, and
and I had my 2 falls at home at
Xmas, they & many others have
all really been a great help to me,
to get me back to life again.
So good luck & let hope we have

P107

a Crewe Town to be proud of
again in the future?

So, you are yes!

Yours hopefully
Leah Stephenson.

My family have been brought
up & lived here for many years,
we, all therefore, real Creweites
is.

PARTON, Lindsey

From: Centre, Call
Sent: 30 January 2012 09:08
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Cc: PARTON, Lindsey
Subject: Crewe Consultation Options Feedback

[Submitted by Anonymous User]

Crewe Community Governance Review

Name:	Andrew Brown
Address:	1 Brown Lees Close Crewe CW2 6AT
Do you represent a particular local group?	No
<p>If you would like to add any further brief comments, please do so in the box below</p> <p>Crewe needs a Town Council as the current arrangement whereby non-Crewe councillors are deciding the fate of the town is completely wrong. It is completely undemocratic that the wishes of the people of this great town are being overridden by those councillors elected by small numbers of voters in leafy villages at the other end of the county.</p>	

Preferred Option(s)

The preferred option(s) would be:

Parish or Town Councils. 16 points out of 27.

All the scores given against the various options:

Option	Total score (out of a possible 27)
No change	3
Parish or Town Councils	16
Neighbourhood Management	13
Community forum	3
Residents' or tenants' association	3

PARTON, Lindsey

From: lenka molcanova [pepeliskka@gmx.co.uk]
Sent: 02 February 2012 13:42
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: single Crewe town council

Hi There,
Lenka Molcanova and Jason Bennett 30 Rolls Avenue Crewe CW13GE we are voting for single crewe town council we wote for YES.
thank you

PARTON, Lindsey

From: Centre, Call
Sent: 10 February 2012 10:46
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Cc: PARTON, Lindsey
Subject: Crewe Consultation Options Feedback

[Submitted by Anonymous User]

Crewe Community Governance Review

Name:	Mr.C.Nicholson
Address:	19 Danebank Avenue Crewe CW2 8AE
Do you represent a particular local group?	No
<p>If you would like to add any further brief comments, please do so in the box below</p> <p>I thought that the original idea of splitting Cheshire into two parts and do away with the Crewe and Nantwich Council was to save money. However, since most other areas in Cheshire East have now got their own local councils, it seems we in Crewe have no alternative but to have our own. So; here we are going back to our original state before the split up of Cheshire into two parts and having spent a great deal of money in the process.</p>	

Preferred Option(s)

The preferred option(s) would be:

Parish or Town Councils. 21 points out of 27.

All the scores given against the various options:

Option	Total score (out of a possible 27)
No change	11
Parish or Town Councils	21
Neighbourhood Management	13
Community forum	9
Residents' or tenants' association	9

PARTON, Lindsey

From: Malcolm Riley [msriley@btinternet.com]
Sent: 18 February 2012 14:55
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Cc: Andrew Taylor
Subject: Crewe Town Council - current vote

Whilst I am not resident within the town of Crewe, I believe I am able to support the current vote process in supporting a 'yes' vote for Crewe to have a Town Council, in view of Councillor Fitzgerald's comment on your website i.e '...those who have an interest in the town'.

I am a deacon and property steward of Union Street Baptist Church, Crewe which owes its beginnings in 1882 to Mr Richard Pedley JP who was an Alderman and Mayor of Crewe. He led the small group of people who first met in an upper room in Station Street, towards the building of the church in 1883-4. Mr Pedley was, like myself, a resident of Winterley, also a cheese factor in the town, having a warehouse in South Street. He was most influential in the early years of Crewe, and it would be good for these beginnings to be recognised again, in Civic terms, with Crewe having the dignity of a Town Council.

Apart from his name being recorded on the Council Chamber's board, we also have the physical presence in the town of the baptist church in Union Street which he helped create, and which still continues in its original use today as an important link with Crewe's early years, and appropriately so is now Grade II listed.

Apart from these historical points, I believe that the creation of Town Council status will assist Crewe's continued success as a significant centre of business and commerce in south Cheshire.

I would be pleased therefore if my name could be added to those voting 'yes' to the creation of 'Crewe Town Council'.

Thank you

Malcolm Riley, 26 Pool Lane, Winterley, Sandbach CW11 4RY

3 Leighton View,
 Crewe,
 Cheshire,
 CW1. 3YT.
 Tel: 01270 580630
 19/2/12.

Ref: Votes in favour of a Town Council in Crewe.
 (DO YOU WANT A SINGLE TOWN COUNCIL)
 MR. S. CORBETT.
 MR. E. A. CORBETT.

Dear, Ms. Parton,

We have not received any ballot papers for this issue. We have been advised by Cheshire East Council to write directly to you to express a preference for or against.

YES WE ARE IN FAVOUR OF A CREWE TOWN COUNCIL.

2 Votes: ~~S. Corbett~~ YES
 S. Corbett YES

Yours Sincerely

~~S. Corbett~~
 S. Corbett

PARTON, Lindsey

From: andrew dixon [dicko601@hotmail.co.uk]
Sent: 22 February 2012 18:19
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: Re: Crewe ballot

Hi lindsey

Thanks for the reply, I live in parkfield off parkers road, and I would like to express my view, If given the choice I would like Crewe to have its own council, thanks for offering to forward my views. Regards Andrew Dixon

Sent from my iPhone

On 22 Feb 2012, at 15:11, "COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW"
 <CommunityGovernance@cheshireeast.gov.uk> wrote:

>
 > Hello
 >
 > Do you not mention your address in your message, but only those
 > residents who live in the area of Crewe which is currently unparished
 > have been sent a voting paper which could explain why you have not
 > received a voting pack. The unparished area covers the Cheshire East
 > Wards of Crewe Central, Crewe East, Crewe North, Crewe South, Crewe St
 > Barnabas, Crewe West and a small part of Leighton.
 >
 > However, you are still welcome to express your views, which you can do
 > by responding to my email by 5pm on Wednesday 29th February. I will
 > ensure that your comments are put forward for consideration by the
 > Council as part of the Review process.
 >
 > Kind regards
 > Lindsey
 >
 > Lindsey Parton
 > Registration Service and Business Manager
 > Cheshire East Council
 > Westfields, Sandbach
 >
 > Tel: 01270 686477
 >
 >
 > -----Original Message-----
 > From: andrew dixon [mailto:dicko601@hotmail.co.uk]
 > Sent: 17 February 2012 16:47
 > To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
 > Subject: Crewe ballot
 >
 >
 > I have just read in the Crewe Guardian newspaper an article about the
 > vote for Crewe's own council, I have never received a ballot paper
 > regarding this vote. Is there anyway I can vote before the closing
 > date ? Regards A Dixon
 >
 > Sent from my iPhone
 > *****
 > **
 > Confidentiality: This email and its contents and any attachments are intended only
 > for the above named. As the email may contain confidential or legally privileged
 > information, if you are not the above named person or responsible for delivery to the
 > above named, or suspect that you are not an intended recipient please delete or
 > destroy the email and any attachments immediately.
 >
 > Security and Viruses: This note confirms that this email message has
 > been swept for the presence of computer viruses. We cannot accept any
 > responsibility for any damage or loss caused by software viruses.
 >

PARTON, Lindsey

From: Andrew Taylor [andrewn.taylor@btinternet.com]
Sent: 23 February 2012 17:45
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Cc: David Cannon; Malcolm and Sandra Riley
Subject: Crewe Town Council

Dear Lindsey Parton,

I write as the Minister of Union Street Baptist Church, in which capacity I responded to the earlier consultation in the matter in 2009. However, unusually for a local minister, I live outside the area currently being polled, though my professional concerns are entirely within it. I am obviously unable to cast a vote in the matter but I hope my views, sent on behalf of the church might be included in the process.

We are strongly of the view that there should be a single town council for Crewe. The concept of community is an important one. Union Street Baptist Church was established over 125 years ago to be at the centre of the community that was developing amongst the workforce of the North Sheds, and that call to serve our community, albeit now a very different one, remains a powerful one for us today. The wider community that is the town of Crewe equally needs to be recognised, identified and served.

The churches of the town, including our own, have in recent years covenanted together in acknowledgement of the fact that although distributed around the town we still serve the town as a whole. Collective endeavours, such as the Christmas Day lunch, the successful hustings meeting held just before the last General Election, and the provision of night shelter accommodation during this winter's cold snap, have been prompted by a concern for the community of Crewe as a whole, and would not have been feasible on a lesser scale. We believe that on a yet broader range of issues a Town Council for Crewe would also serve that purpose.

I hope these views might be taken into account.

With sincere thanks,

Andrew Taylor
Minister
Union Street Baptist Church

PARTON, Lindsey

From: Centre, Call
Sent: 28 February 2012 09:11
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Cc: PARTON, Lindsey
Subject: Crewe Consultation Options Feedback

[Submitted by Anonymous User]

Crewe Community Governance Review

Name:	David Elliott
Address:	32 Broughton Lane Wistaston Crewe CW2 8JP
Do you represent a particular local group?	No
If you would like to add any further brief comments, please do so in the box below	

Preferred Option(s)

The preferred option(s) would be:

Parish or Town Councils. 25 points out of 27.

All the scores given against the various options:

Option	Total score (out of a possible 27)
No change	3
Parish or Town Councils	25
Neighbourhood Management	24
Community forum	24
Residents' or tenants' association	24

A12

103 Coleridge Way

CREST

CW01 5LE

I wish to vote for a
Toron Council.

P. A. HARRISON

Pd Hansen

A11

103 Coleridge Way

CREST

CW01 5LE

28-02-12

I wish to vote for a
Toron Council

P. A. HARRISON

Pd Hansen

I am in favour of a Town Council
for Greve. 27/2/12 EWS 6QG

FAO Lindsey Parton
Cheshire East
Westfields
Middlewich Road
Sandbach
Cheshire CW11 9HZ

Vote for Crewe Council

Dear Madam,

We the undersigned wish to vote in favour of having a Crewe Council

Name	Address	Signature
DEREK GEORGE SHAW	57 COLERIDGE WAY CREWE CW1 5JX	D Shaw
Ann Shaw	57 Coleridge Way Crewe CW1 5JX	A S Shaw
John Bryan	61 Coleridge Way Crewe CW1 5JX	J Bryan
Margaret Bryan	61 Coleridge Way Crewe CW1 5JX	M. Bryan
Jack Brooker	59, COLERIDGE WAY CREWE CW1 5JX	J Brooker
Jacky Brooker	59, COLERIDGE WAY CREWE CW1 5JX	J Brooker
GEORGE STOBBS	65 COLERIDGE WAY, CREWE CW1 5JX	G Stobbs
PAUL NOWNALL	67 COLERIDGE WAY, CREWE CW1 5JX	P Nownall
Margaret Bell	69, Coleridge Way Crewe	M Bell
DARILE TAYLOR	71, COLERIDGE WAY, CREWE	D Taylor
CLARE TAYLOR	71 COLERIDGE WAY, CREWE	C Taylor
Sadie Hulme	63 Coleridge way, crewe, CW1 5JX	S Hulme
JASON BARNES	63 COLERIDGE WAY, CREWE	J Barnes
PHILIP SHAW	(138 ELM DRIVE CREWE) (FORMALLY 57 COLERIDGE WAY)	P Shaw

(NONE OF THE ABOVE HAVE RECEIVED VOTING PAPERS)

Crewe Community Governance Review

Voting Paper for Electors

1. Place a cross (x) in the box below opposite the option you are voting for.
2. Put no other mark on the voting paper or your vote may not be counted.
3. Once completed, return by post in the pre-paid envelope without delay.
4. The voting paper must be received by no later than **5pm** on **Wednesday 29 February 2012**.

Question:

Do you want a single Town Council for Crewe?

YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>

Crewe Community Governance Review

Voting Paper for Electors

1. Place a cross (x) in the box below opposite the option you are voting for.
2. Put no other mark on the voting paper or your vote may not be counted.
3. Once completed, return by post in the pre-paid envelope without delay.
4. The voting paper must be received by no later than **5pm** on **Wednesday 29 February 2012**.

Question:

Do you want a single Town Council for Crewe?

YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>

Crewe Community Governance Review

Voting Paper for Electors

1. Place a cross (x) in the box below opposite the option you are voting for.
2. Put no other mark on the voting paper or your vote may not be counted.
3. Once completed, return by post in the pre-paid envelope without delay.
4. The voting paper must be received by no later than **5pm on Wednesday 29 February 2012.**

Question:

Do you want a single Town Council for Crewe?

YES	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>

Voting Paper for Electors

Voting Paper for Electors

- 1. Place a cross (x) in the box below opposite the option you are voting for.
- 2. Put no other mark on the voting paper or your vote may not be counted.
- 3. Once completed, return by post in the pre-paid envelope without delay.
- 4. The voting paper must be received by no later than 5pm on Wednesday 29 February 2012.

- 1. Place a cross (x) in the box below opposite the option you are voting for.
- 2. Put no other mark on the voting paper or your vote may not be counted.
- 3. Once completed, return by post in the pre-paid envelope without delay.
- 4. The voting paper must be received by no later than 5pm on Wednesday 29 February 2012.

Question:

Do you want a single Town Council for Crewe?

Question:

Do you want a single Town Council for Crewe?

YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>

YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>

A20

2-2-2012

Yes X

I would like a single loose carnal.

Note lost postcard envelope.

Nigel Panton

98 Davenport Avenue

Leam

EW26LT

01290 652931

This page is intentionally left blank

PARTON, Lindsey

From: Centre, Call
Sent: 13 January 2012 21:18
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Cc: PARTON, Lindsey
Subject: Crewe Consultation Options Feedback

[Submitted by Anonymous User]

Crewe Community Governance Review

Name:	I. Hassall 11 Hawthorn lane
Address:	11 Hawthorn Lane Crewe
Do you represent a particular local group?	No
<p>If you would like to add any further brief comments, please do so in the box below</p> <p>why do we need a council in crewe when the government set up a unitary authority to remove all the layers of governance. Is this same democratic process to be carried out in macclesfield or do they have sufficient representation at cheshire east to ensure that their needs are catered for.</p>	

Preferred Option(s)

The preferred option(s) would be:

No Change. 5 points out of a possible 27.

All the scores given against the various options:

Option	Total score (out of a possible 27)
No change	5
Parish or Town Councils	4
Neighbourhood Management	3
Community forum	3
Residents' or tenants' association	3

PARTON, Lindsey

To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW

Subject: RE: Proposed Crewe Town Council

-----Original Message-----

Sent: 27 January 2012 16:22

To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW

Subject: Re: Proposed Crewe Town Council

Dear Sir/Madam, We are against the proposed Crewe Town Council or Parish Council, We prefer that the present arrangements are kept.

Kind Regards

P & M Eustance
21 Herbert Street
Crewe Cheshire
CW1 5LZ

06/03/2012

PARTON, Lindsey

From: terence stubbs [christerry@sky.com]
Sent: 08 February 2012 11:16
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: Re: local council for crewe

thank you for the reply
i know that £15.50 is not a lot of money for one year
but what will the cost rise to in future years
so with that i mind i will be voting no
your t j stubbs

On Tue, Feb 7, 2012 at 12:09 PM, COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
<CommunityGovernance@cheshireeast.gov.uk> wrote:

Thank you for your email.

More information is available on the Council's website.

I attach some information that I hope will help.

The additional cost per household is estimated to be £15.50 per year

Paul Jones
Democratic Services Team Manager
Cheshire East Council
Westfields, Middlewich Road,
Sandbach, Cheshire.
CW11 1HZ.
Tel. 01270 686458

<http://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/>

PARTON, Lindsey

From: terence stubbs [christerry@sky.com]
Sent: 03 February 2012 09:14
To: COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW
Subject: local council for crewe

dear sirs

this is probable a question that has been asked before
but would a singular council for crewe increase our council tax or would there be
another tax to pay ie a local one like the old parish council tax
or would there be addition tax paid by the residents of crewe to finance
the singular crewe council

yours

tj stubbs cw2 6ne
christerry@sky.com

Mr D. Perry.

10 Grenville Close,

Haslington,

Crewe.

20 February 2012.

Dear Lindsey,

Re my phone call to you at lunchtime today, about the reforming of Crewe Borough Council and the lack of information for all the people of the Borough. I suggested that maybe a "Flyer" distribution throughout the whole Bough, as I said I would be prepared to do an area of Haslington I stand by that, but think maybe the "Flyer" should ask for volunteers to help. Also the formation of a Forum of ordinary people working with and alongside with your committee dealing with this issue. As I said to you there are a lot of people I have spoken to who know nothing of this issue and I personally believe that if this new Council will better represent our Town at a Local level then Local people from all parts of the Borough should be allowed to be involved if that's what they want to do.

Kind Regards,

David Perry.

Tel-01270586507

Email- david.s.perry@talktalk.net

This page is intentionally left blank

COUNCIL MEETING – 19 APRIL 2012**EXTRACT FROM STRATEGIC PLANNING BOARD MINUTES – 21 MARCH 2012****NOTICE OF MOTION: SYDNEY ROAD BRIDGE - CREWE**

The Board considered a report on a Notice of Motion submitted to Council on 23rd February 2012 regarding the impact of development on Sydney Road Bridge in Crewe.

The motion, which had been proposed by Councillor S Hogben, was as follows:

*“Coppenhall East Crewe
No large scale housing plans in Coppenhall East should be approved or signed off until essential improvements to the road bridge over the Crewe to Manchester railway line on Sydney Road, as well as the northern relief road from Crewe Green roundabout to the A530 Middlewich Road, have been approved.”*

Councillor Hogben attended the meeting to explain the background to the motion.

Sydney Road was an important distributor route in northern Crewe. It connected the Leighton and Coppenhall areas of Crewe with the Crewe Green Roundabout.

On 19th October 2011, the Strategic Planning Board approved a planning application for 650 homes during the spring of 2011 on a site at Coppenhall East.

The Council had a duty to consider and determine planning applications provided they were properly made. If any future application had an impact on the Sydney Road bridge, this would be a material consideration in its determination. However, the Council could not rule out the proper assessment of development proposals which may come forward at a future time.

The Motion did, however, serve to emphasise an area of concern on the local highway network. It would be appropriate for the Strategic Board and other planning committees to explore the impact of proposed development on the bridge and examine whether applications were accompanied by suitable measures to mitigate any identified impacts. In addition, the forthcoming Cheshire East Local Plan would be underpinned by further traffic studies and would be accompanied by an Infrastructure Plan.

RESOLVED

That

- (1) the Board notes that a decision was made on planning application 11/1643 for Coppenhall East on 19th October 2011;
- (2) the Board further notes that the Council has a duty to consider and determine any fresh planning application in the Coppenhall area strictly on its planning merits; and
- (3) the Officers be asked to pursue the inclusion of a scheme for the improvement of the Sydney Road Bridge in the Local Transport Plan to enable the scheme to receive suitable prioritisation, and the improvement of the Bridge be identified as an issue within the Local Plan Infrastructure Plan at the appropriate time.

CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL

Strategic Planning Board

Date of Meeting: 21 March 2012
Report of: Strategic Planning & Housing Manager
Subject/Title: Notice of Motion - Sydney Road Bridge - Crewe
Portfolio Holder: Cllrs David Brown & Rachel Bailey

1.0 Report Summary

- 1.1 This report responds to a Notice of Motion put to the Full Council on 23 February regarding the impact of development on Sydney Road Bridge in Crewe.

2.0 Recommendation(s)

- 2.1 That the Board notes that a decision was made on planning application 11/1643 for Coppenhall East on 19 October 2011
- 2.2 That the board notes that the Council has a duty to consider and determine any fresh planning application in the Coppenhall area strictly on its planning merits.

3.0 Reasons for Recommendation(s)

- 3.1 To ensure the Council deals correctly and consistently with future planning applications.

4.0 Wards Affected

- 4.1 The bridge is located in Crewe East ward but other residents in Crewe and those travelling into the area also use the bridge.

5.0 Local Ward Members

- 5.1 Councillors Martin, Newton & Thorley

6.0 Policy Implications

- 6.1 The report clarifies the Council's policy approach to this subject.

7.0 Financial Implications

- 7.1 None.

8.0 Legal Implications

- 8.1 The Council has a duty to consider properly made planning applications as part of its role as statutory planning Authority. S.38 of the 2004 planning Act requires applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. It is also a long standing principle that each application must be determined on its merits.

9.0 Risk Management Implications

- 9.1 The Council needs to ensure that the impacts of new development are properly taken account of within planning applications. If it does not do so, problems will be bequeathed to subsequent generations.

10.0 Sydney Road Bridge

- 10.1 The Sydney Road Bridge is located on the north east side of Crewe. Sydney Road is a Classified 'B' Road which acts as a distributor route serving the north side of Crewe and connecting it to key destinations such as the Bentley Factory and Leighton Hospital. At the Full Council on 23 February the following Notice of Motion was received:

"Coppenhall East Crewe

No large scale housing plans in Coppenhall East should be approved or signed off until essential improvements to the road bridge over the Crewe to Manchester railway line on Sydney Road, as well as the northern relief road from Crewe Green roundabout to the A530 Middlewich Road, have been approved."

This motion then falls to be considered by the Strategic Planning Board as the relevant Council Committee

- 10.2 Sydney Road is an important distributor route in northern Crewe. It connects the Leighton and Coppenhall areas of Crewe with the Crewe Green Roundabout. This in turn leads to Sandbach, J17 of the M6, Haslington, Alsager and areas to the south. The bridge itself crosses the main Crewe – Manchester railway line and is of a narrow single carriageway only. Currently the bridge is signal controlled – and acts as a constraint on the Crewe road network
- 10.3 Council received a planning application for 650 homes during the spring of 2011 on a site at Coppenhall East. This land lies to the north of the Sydney Road bridge. At a meeting of the Strategic Planning Board on 19 October 2011 it was resolved that this application be approved. Consequently the Council has already made its decision in relation to this application. Minor Improvements to the traffic signal arrangements were secured as part of the development mitigation package.

- 10.4 With regard to future planning applications, the Council has a duty to consider and determine these provided they are properly made. If any application has an impact on the Sydney Street bridge, this will be a material consideration in its determination. However the Council cannot at this stage rule out the proper assessment of development proposals which may come forward at a future time.
- 10.5 However the notice of motion does serve to emphasise an area of concern on the local highway network. It will be perfectly legitimate for the Strategic Board and other planning committees to explore the impact of proposed development on the bridge and examine whether applications are accompanied by suitable measures to mitigate any identified impacts. In addition the forthcoming Cheshire East Local Plan will be underpinned by further traffic studies and will be accompanied by an Infrastructure Plan.
- 10.6 As examination of transport impacts forms part of the normal planning application and development plan process the Council is requested to take no further action in response to the Notice of Motion.

11.0 Access to Information

The background papers relating to this report can be inspected by contacting the report writer:

Name: Adrian Fisher

Designation: Strategic Planning & Housing Manager

Tel No: 01270 686641

Email: adrian.fisher@cheshireeast.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL

COUNCIL

Date of meeting: 19th April 2012
Report of: Democratic Services and Registration Manager
Title: Election of Mayor and Deputy Mayor for the 2012/13 Civic Year

1.0 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To consider nominations for the office of Mayor and Deputy Mayor for 2012/13.

2.0 Decision Required

- 2.1 Council is requested to:-

Resolve that Councillor G Walton be designated as the Mayor Elect and that a second Member be designated as the Deputy Mayor Elect, with a view to their formal election as Mayor and Deputy Mayor for Cheshire East for 2012/2013, at the Mayor Making ceremony, to be held on 16th May 2012.

3.0 Financial Implications

- 3.1 None.

4.0 Legal Implications

- 4.1 The meeting of Annual Council must formally elect the Mayor and appoint a Deputy Mayor.

5.0 Risk Assessment

- 5.1 There are no risks in respect of the recommendations. There is advantage in Council designating Members as Mayor and Deputy Mayor Elect in advance of the Annual Meeting, in order for there to be certainty prior to the beginning of the new civic year.

6.0 Background and Options

- 6.1 At the meeting of the Council held on 25th February 2010 a protocol for the selection of Mayor and Deputy Mayor and other Mayoral matters was approved. This made provision in respect of a number of matters relating to the Civic Office and the Mayor and Deputy Mayor; including provision as to the election of the Mayor and the appointment of the Deputy Mayor.
- 6.2 This report asks Council to agree which Members will be elected as Mayor and appointed as Deputy Mayor, at the Annual Council meeting. Such a decision

will give certainty to the proposed civic office holders and to officers, in making arrangements for the new civic year.

7.0 Reasons for Recommendation

- 7.1 The reasons for the recommendations are to ensure that appropriate arrangements can be made for the Mayor Making ceremony on 16th May 2012 and to agree a process to ensure that matters affecting the Mayoralty can be agreed in a timely manner with appropriate Member input.

For further information:

*Officer: Brian Reed Democratic and Registration Services Manager
Tel No: 01270-686670*

Email: brian.reed@cheshireeast.gov.uk

Background Documents:

None

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1, 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1, 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1, 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1, 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1, 2, 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank