

# Governance and Ethics Committee

7 July 2022

**Time** 2.00 pm **Public Meeting?** Yes **Type of meeting** Advisory group

**Venue** Council Chamber - 4th Floor - Civic Centre

## Membership

**Chair** Cllr John Reynolds (Lab)  
**Vice Chair** Cllr Jonathan Crofts (Con)

### Labour

Cllr Dr Paul John Birch J.P.  
Cllr Celia Hibbert  
Cllr Louise Miles  
Cllr Phil Page  
Cllr Milkinderpal Jaspal  
Cllr Rita Potter

### Conservative

Cllr Simon Bennett  
Cllr Wendy Thompson

Quorum for this meeting is three Councillors.

## Information for the Public

If you have any queries about this meeting, please contact the Democratic Services team:

**Contact** Donna Cope  
**Tel/Email** 01902 554452 or Email: [donna.cope@wolverhampton.gov.uk](mailto:donna.cope@wolverhampton.gov.uk)  
**Address** Democratic Services, Civic Centre, 1<sup>st</sup> floor, St Peter's Square,  
Wolverhampton WV1 1RL

Copies of other agendas and reports are available from:

**Website** <http://wolverhampton.moderngov.co.uk/>  
**Email** [democratic.services@wolverhampton.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@wolverhampton.gov.uk)  
**Tel** 01902 550320

Please take note of the protocol for filming, recording, and use of social media in meetings, copies of which are displayed in the meeting room.

Some items are discussed in private because of their confidential or commercial nature. These reports are not available to the public.

---

# Agenda

## Part 1 – items open to the press and public

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>Title</i>
1	<b>Apologies for absence</b>
2	<b>Declarations of interest</b>
3	<b>Minutes of the previous meeting</b> (Pages 3 - 8) [To approve the minutes of the previous meeting held on 25 March 2022 as a correct record].
4	<b>Matters arising</b> [To discuss any matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting].
5	<b>Update from Monitoring Officer</b> [To receive an update from the Monitoring Officer – Report to follow]
6	<b>Conferring the Title of Honorary Alderman</b> (Pages 9 - 12) [To consider conferring the title of Honorary Alderman]
7	<b>Changes to the Constitution</b> [To consider the amendments to the Constitution – Report to follow].
8	<b>Schedule of Petitions Scheme</b> (Pages 13 - 42) [To note the report]
9	<b>Evaluation of May 2022 Elections</b> (To Follow) [Report to follow]
10	<b>Polling District and Polling Place Review</b> (To Follow) [Report to follow]
11	<b>Provision of Fairtrade drinks within City Assets</b> (To Follow) [Report to follow]
12	<b>Arrangements for dealing with Code of Conduct complaints</b> (To Follow) [Report to follow]
13	<b>Corporate Code of Governance</b> (To Follow) [Report to follow]

## Attendance

### Members of the Governance and Ethics Committee

Cllr John Reynolds (Chair)  
Cllr Jonathan Crofts (Vice-Chair)  
Cllr Dr Paul John Birch J.P.  
Cllr Claire Darke  
Cllr Celia Hibbert  
Cllr Milkinderpal Jaspal  
Cllr Rita Potter  
Cllr Sandra Samuels OBE  
Cllr Simon Bennett  
Cllr Wendy Thompson

### Employees

David Pattison	Chief Operating Officer
Jas Kaur	Democratic Services Manager
Donna Cope	Democratic Services Officer
Jacob Stokes	Democratic Services Assistant

## Part 1 – items open to the press and public

*Item No.*    *Title*

- 1 Apologies for absence**  
There were no apologies for absence received.
- 2 Declarations of interest**  
There were no declarations of interest.
- 3 Minutes of the previous meeting**  
That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 25 February 2022 be approved as a correct record.
- 4 Matters arising**  
There were no matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting.

5 **Municipal Calendar of Meetings 2022-2023**

David Pattison, Chief Operating Officer, presented the municipal calendar of meetings for 2022 - 2023. The report proposed a timetable for Council and committee meetings for the next Council Municipal Year (2022-2023).

He noted that no meetings would take place on the Thursday following Full Council meetings in future, and that an additional Scrutiny Board meeting had been scheduled for 7 February 2023 to allow the panel to go through the proposed budget in detail before the Full Council meeting on 1 March 2023.

He further noted that amendments could be made to the schedule by relevant councillors and officers.

Councillor John Reynolds moved the recommendations in the report. Councillor Jonathan Crofts seconded the recommendations.

The Committee discussed the proposed schedule of meetings.

Responding to questions, the Chief Operating Officer advised members that Governance and Ethics Committee meetings had been moved to Thursdays to avoid clashes with West Midlands Combined Authority (WMCA) meetings.

Responding to questions, the Chief Operating Officer advised that in future the budget Council meeting would only have the budget item on the agenda and if other items required urgent consideration an additional meeting of the Full Council would be arranged.

Responding to further questions, he noted that scrutiny panels were likely to meet more often than the minimum of four meetings a year.

He advised members that the previously proposed Cabinet Advisory Groups would not be proceeding, and that a pilot for a Select Committee was currently running instead. He advised members that the outcomes of the Wolverhampton Pound Select Committee would be evaluated and brought before both the Governance and Ethics Committee and Full Council.

Resolved:

1. That Council be recommended to approve the City of Wolverhampton Council Municipal Calendar of Meetings for 2022-2023 as detailed in Appendix 1.
2. That consultation with the political groups on the City of Wolverhampton Council Municipal Calendar of Meetings for 2022-2023 be approved.
3. That any amendments to the City of Wolverhampton Council Calendar of Meetings for 2022-2023 be delegated to the Chair of Governance Committee in consultation with the Director of Governance following consultation with political groups.

6 **Preparations for Local Elections and East Park By-Election**

David Pattison, Chief Operating Officer, presented a report on the preparations for the local elections and the East Park by-election and it was noted that detailed preparation and planning was underway.

He stated, that following expert advice, health and safety measures would be significantly less strict than last year, and that the count would be conducted with full staff levels in the usual venue of Aldersley Leisure Centre.

He advised members that the by-election would provide a test run for any new measures and this would allow time for any fine tweaks before the full count on 5 May 2022. He noted that the procedures and precautions put in place were similar to those implemented by other authorities with one or two exceptions.

It was noted that the East Park by-election results would be verified and counted in the Civic Centre, with the result expected by 1am. The final results from the local elections would be expected by 3am.

Councillor John Reynolds moved the recommendation in the report. Councillor Jonathan Crofts seconded the recommendation.

Resolved:

1. That the preparations underway for the forthcoming elections be noted.

7

### **Constitution Review**

David Pattison, Chief Operating Officer, presented a report on Constitution Review. The report detailed proposed changes to the constitution to ensure continuing lawfulness and effectiveness. He provided an overview of the proposed changes and the rationale for these changes as detailed in section three of the report.

He advised members of two key proposed changes to the Full Council Procedure Rules:

- An amendment to Rule 19.1 to include a reference to respect.
- A scheme whereby the public could ask questions at Full Council. He noted that this would not apply to the budget-setting meeting.

Councillor John Reynolds moved the recommendations in the report. Councillor Jonathan Crofts seconded the recommendations.

Members of the Committee provided feedback on the proposed changes.

Responding to questions, the Chief Operating Officer advised that the amendment to Rule 19.1 would be to ensure that the debate remained focused on the issues at hand and was not intended to water down the debate.

It was confirmed that any public questions would need to be submitted in writing and in advance of a Full Council meeting.

Responding to further questions, the Chief Operating Officer confirmed that the viewing figures for public meetings would be circulated to members, and that a practical explanation of the term 'working days' would be added to the Constitution.

Resolved:

1. That Council be recommended to:
  - a. Approve the amendments to the Constitution as detailed in the report.
  - b. Authorise the Monitoring Officer to implement the changes.

2. That the viewing figures for public committee meetings be circulated.
3. That a definition of the term 'working days' be added to the Constitution.

8 **Annual Report on Code of Conduct Matters**

David Pattison, Chief Operating Officer, presented the Annual Report on Code of Conduct Matters. The report provided an annual update on the activity on matters involving the Code of Conduct for Councillors.

He noted that, as a result of the Localism Act 2011, all Local Authorities were required to have a code of conduct and that Wolverhampton Council had adopted the Local Government Authority's (LGA) model code of conduct in May 2021 following consideration by the Governance and Ethics Committee.

He explained that the Council had adopted the LGA approach of handling complaints which meant that complaints would be dealt with confidentially until they became public through a report to the Committee.

It was noted that some complaints would be dealt with by police and that no internal investigation would take place whilst an official police investigation was ongoing.

He advised members that the Council currently had one independent person appointed and proposed that more were appointed as a matter of good practice and that these appointees should reflect the diverse community of Wolverhampton.

It was noted that the current legislation prevented the Council from imposing effective sanctions.

He advised members that there had been delays in dealing with complaints due to the pandemic and that a Deputy Monitoring Officer had been appointed to assist with dealing with these complaints.

He noted that most complaints related to the use of social media, so the Committee was recommended to adopt the Social Media Protocol in Appendix 1 of the report.

The Committee discussed the Annual Code of Conduct report, the Social Media Protocol and the proposed additional training on declarations of interest.

Responding to questions, the Chief Operating Officer noted that additional training would be provided by internal officers as well as external bodies. He advised members that criminal complaints would go through the police first before being investigated by the authority so as to not prejudice the police investigation.

The Chief Operating Officer endorsed the Committee's comments that members should feel safe from harassment in the Civic Centre and noted that legislation stated that an official complaint needed to be made before an investigation could begin.

He stated that the Local Authority was limited legally when it came to investigating complaints and that other authorities had tried to go further but had been limited following judicial review. He noted that additional training, using external lawyers, and appointing an additional resource were the actions that the Council was currently taking.

He advised members that a more detailed report would be brought to a future meeting.

Resolved:

1. That the report on Code of Conduct Matters be noted.
2. That the Social Media Protocol at Appendix 1 be noted.
3. That the recruitment of additional independent persons be agreed.
4. That a more detailed report on Code of Conduct matters be brought to a future meeting.

9 **Update from Monitoring Officer**

David Pattison, Chief Operating Officer, provided an update on the work programme and other matters within the scope of the Governance and Ethics Committee's remit.

He noted that a report on the Local Government Boundary Commission for England's (LGBCE) review would be brought to a future meeting of the Committee, and that this would include a detailed polling station review. He advised that a key aspect of this review would be to reduce or eliminate the use of schools as polling stations.

He noted that progress was continuing on improving the Councillor Enquiries Unit, and that Councillor feedback was being taken into account.

He advised that the updated Councillor Allowances Scheme would be in place for four years following the local elections on 5 May 2022.

Councillor John Reynolds moved the recommendations in the report. Councillor Jonathan Crofts seconded the recommendations.

Resolved:

1. That the update from the Monitoring Officer be noted.

This page is intentionally left blank



<b>CITY OF WOLVERHAMPTON COUNCIL</b>	<b>Governance and Ethics Committee</b> 7 July 2022
--	---

<b>Report title</b>	Conferring the Title of Honorary Alderman	
<b>Cabinet member with lead responsibility</b>	Councillor Ian Brookfield Leader of the Council	
<b>Accountable director</b>	David Pattison, Chief Operating Officer	
<b>Originating service</b>	Governance	
<b>Accountable employee</b>	David Pattison	Chief Operating Officer
	Tel	01902 550320
	Email	David.pattison@wolverhampton.gov.uk
<b>Report to be considered by</b>	Council	20 July 2022

---

**Recommendation for decision:**

The Governance and Ethics Committee is recommended to:

1. Convene an extraordinary meeting on the 20 July 2022 to confer the title of Honorary Alderman on former Councillor Keith Inston.

## **1.0 Purpose**

- 1.1 To consider whether to confer the title of Honorary Alderman on former Councillor Keith Inston who ceased to be a Member of the Council in May 2022.

## **2.0 Background**

- 2.1 In July 1998 the Council agreed to establish a policy for the appointment of Honorary Aldermen, for which there is provision in the Local Government Act 1972 (Section 249). Subsequently, in September 1998, the then Policy and Resources Committee endorsed a procedure for reporting to Council on this matter and determined the eligibility criteria. The service criterion was reduced from 24 years to 20 years by resolution of full Council on 14 July 2010.
- 2.2 Mr Inston has a total of 24 years' distinguished service. During this time, he has not only served the residents of East Park Ward, but also held many important positions within the Council impacting on the lives of the citizens of our whole City. They are too numerous to mention, but in particular he Chaired Planning Committee and Audit Committee. He was Vice Chair of Licensing Committee, Pensions Committee and Investment Advisory Sub-Committee. He had also taken an active part on the other regulatory committees, scrutiny panels and reviews and advisory bodies he served on.
- 2.3 Mr Inston's service meets the criterion for eligibility for conferment agreed by the Council. Following consultation with the political groups on the Council it is proposed that the title of Honorary Alderman is bestowed on him.
- 2.4 Under the provisions of the Council's Constitution, the function of advising full Council on the conferment of the title of Honorary Alderman rests with the Governance and Ethics Committee, and therefore, the Committee is asked to consider this proposal.
- 2.5 Honorary Aldermen are invited to attend full Council meetings in a non-participating capacity and are also invited to various functions such as Civic and Remembrance Sunday and other appropriate civic events. The names of Honorary Aldermen are inscribed on a roll of honour board on the ground floor of the Civic Centre.
- 2.6 The Local Government Act 1972 Act provides that an extraordinary Council meeting be convened for the purpose of conferring the title and the necessary resolution must be passed by not less than two thirds of the Members voting. It is proposed that the extraordinary meeting be convened prior to the ordinary Council meeting on 20 July 2022

## **3.0 Financial implications**

- 3.1 As was the case with previous Honorary Aldermen it is the intention to present the former Councillor with a badge of office. These will be drawn from an existing stock of badges purchased prior to this financial year. A small cost will be incurred in inscribing the name of the Honorary Alderman on the badge, and also on the roll of honour board, but this

can easily be accommodated within existing Democratic Services budgets.  
[GE/16052022/L]

#### **4.0 Legal implications**

4.1 Section 249 of the Local Government Act 1972 enables a local authority to confer the title of Honorary Alderman on “persons who have, in the opinion of the Council, rendered eminent services to the Council as past Members of the Council but who are not then members of the Council”. [SZ/28062022/P]

#### **5.0 Equalities implications**

5.1 There are no direct equalities implications arising from the recommendation of this report.

#### **6.0 All other Implications**

6.1 There are no other implications arising from the recommendation of this report.

#### **7.0 Schedule of background papers**

7.1 None.

#### **8.0 Apprentices**

8.1 None

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>CITY OF WOLVERHAMPTON COUNCIL</b>	<b>Governance and Ethics Committee</b> 7 July 2022
--	---

<b>Report title</b>	Schedule of Petitions	
<b>Cabinet member with lead responsibility</b>	Councillor Paula Brookfield Cabinet Member for Governance and Equalities	
<b>Accountable director</b>	David Pattison, Chief Operating Officer	
<b>Originating service</b>	Democratic Services	
<b>Accountable employee</b>	David Pattison	Chief Operating Officer
	Tel	01902 550320
	Email	<a href="mailto:David.pattison@wolverhampton.gov.uk">David.pattison@wolverhampton.gov.uk</a>
<b>Report to be/has been considered by</b>	N/a	

---

**Recommendations for noting:**

The Governance and Ethics Committee is asked to note:

1. The actions taken in relation to all petitions received by the Council during the last year.

## **1.0 Purpose**

- 1.1 To note the actions taken in relation to petitions received by the Council during the last six months attached in the Appendix 1.

## **2.0 Background**

- 2.1 At the Council meeting on 3 November 2021, Council approved the revised Petitions Scheme.
- 2.2 Section 46 of the Localism Act 2011 repealed all of Chapter 2 of the Local Democracy, Economic Development & Construction Act 2009, which in essence removed the requirement for local authorities to have a statutory petitions scheme. Therefore, the Council now has greater discretion in how it decides to deal with citizens' petitions.
- 2.3 However, it is still considered good practice for a Council to retain a petition scheme as it sends a clear message to the public that the Council takes their views seriously and encourages their engagement in the democratic process.

## **3.0 Implementation and Monitoring of the Petitions Scheme**

- 3.1 All petitions submitted to the Council are received and monitored by Democratic Services.
- 3.2 Following receipt, petitions will be forwarded to the relevant service who will confirm if the Council can action the petition.
- 3.3 Petitions with fewer than 2499 signatures are considered and responded to by employees, within 28 days of receipt by the relevant service area. A summary of responses will be reported to the relevant Cabinet Member(s), and the relevant Ward Members.
- 3.4 Petitions with 2500-4999 signatures are considered by the relevant scrutiny panel with recommendations made for action by employees or review by the Executive as appropriate.
- 3.5 Petitions with more than 5000 signatures are considered by Full Council.
- 3.6 It is suggested that the Governance and Ethics Committee receive a quarterly/six monthly report presenting this information. This would ensure that the Committee are informed of actions taken in relation to all petitions received by the Council, including those considered by other scrutiny bodies and Full Council.

## **4.0 Financial implications**

- 4.1 There are no financial implications associated with the recommendation in this report as Councillors are asked only to note the actions taken in relation to petitions received by the Council. [GE/13062022/A].

## **5.0 Legal implications**

5.1 The duty for local authorities to operate a statutory petition scheme was abolished by the Localism Act 2011. [SZ/20062022/P]

## **6.0 Equalities implications**

6.1 The proposals outlined in this report do not require an equalities analysis. The recommendations will not affect the Council's practice of encouraging, considering and responding to petitions.

## **7.0 All other Implications**

7.1 There are no other implications arising from this report.

## **8.0 Schedule of background papers**

8.1 [Revised Petitions Scheme, Council, 3 November 2021](#)

## **9.0 Appendices**

9.1 Appendix 1: Schedule of Petitions

This page is intentionally left blank



Date Received	Issue Raised	Number of (Valid) Signatories	Responsible Officer	Status and Action Taken
5 May 2021	<p><b>Objection to the proposal of Lidl at the Former Quality Hotel Site, 126 Penn Road</b></p> <p>Petition opposed the demolition of existing buildings and the erection of a Class E limited assortment discount food store with associated car parking access, landscaping and engineering works at the former Quality Hotel Site, 126 Penn Road.</p>	44	Andrew Johnson, Planning Officer	<p>Status – Closed</p> <p><b>Summary:</b> The Lead Petitioner was advised that the petition was part of an objection to a planning application and therefore not a valid petition. Subsequently, the Lead Officer advised that he would include the petition in the planning file to ensure it was recorded.</p> <p><b>Full Response:</b> n/a (Handled by Planning)</p>
7 May 2021	<p><b>Issues with parking, vehicle safety and Road Safety on Leicester Street, Wolverhampton</b></p> <p>Requested the Council to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remove the double yellow lines on Leicester Street. This will increase the parking available to residents.</li> <li>2. Provide residents of Leicester Street with a maximum of 2 resident parking permits per household. These permits are not just for match days, but for all</li> </ol>	44	Nick Broomhall, Service Lead – Traffic and Road Safety	<p>Status – Closed</p> <p><b>Summary:</b> The Lead Petitioner was advised that the yellow lines/ double yellow lines in place served to reduce the congestion of the street situated outside a school and increase visibility at the junction. Parking permits do not guarantee parking for all residents and the new cul-de-sac sections were left to off-set any loss of parking on Leicester Street. A one- way system could potentially lead to increases in traffic/ speeding on other local roads. The Lead Petitioner was advised that the Council would request Civil Enforcement Officers to visit Leicester Street to take enforcement action if vehicles are parking in contravention of the double</p>

Date Received	Issue Raised	Number of (Valid) Signatories	Responsible Officer	Status and Action Taken
	<p>year round. Anyone not displaying a permit should be fined.</p> <p>3. Provide Visitor "scratch cards" which residents must purchase from the council. The resident provides the scratch card to the visitor and the visitor must scratch the Month and Date on the card.</p> <p>The Visitor should then display this card in their vehicle. One card must be used for each day the vehicle is parked in the controlled area. Any vehicle not displaying a visitor permit shall be given a penalty.</p> <p>4. Make the east side of Leicester Street one-way. New signage should be erected to reflect the new one-way system and the new parking restrictions in the area.</p>			<p>yellow lines and will continue to review Leicester Street to consider whether any interventions are required in the future.</p> <p><b>Full Response:</b>  <i>I write in response to the petition concerning the above which you presented to the Council, and which was formally received on 7 May 2021.</i></p> <p><i>The yellow lines on Leicester Street, to which you refer were implemented for a number of reasons. One was that, as you may recall, there is an existing road narrowing which was situated in front of the school. They served to restrict people from parking on or near the narrowing to prevent congestion. They also served to provide a 'passing place' where oncoming vehicles can give way so that the traffic flow is maintained.</i></p> <p><i>There are also some double yellow lines on the junction formed by the access to the recently constructed residential development on the former school site. These are there to prevent drivers from parking close to the junction and obscuring visibility, so that vehicles can access the new road safely.</i></p> <p><i>I will put in a request to our Parking Services section for their Civil Enforcement Officers to visit Leicester</i></p>

Date Received	Issue Raised	Number of (Valid) Signatories	Responsible Officer	Status and Action Taken
				<p><i>Street and take enforcement action if vehicles are parking in contravention of the Double Yellow Lines.</i></p> <p><i>I realise that the construction of the new access, together with the associated yellow lines may have resulted in the loss of some parking spaces on Leicester Street. However, sections of the new cul-de-sac have been left unrestricted to off-set any loss of parking on Leicester Street. The new properties fronting Leicester Street also have an off-road parking area to the rear designed to reduce on-street parking demands of the new properties.</i></p> <p><i>I also note your request for parking permits and scratch cards for residents of Leicester Street. This is something that the City of Wolverhampton Council has considered carefully and consulted on previously. However, we have taken the decision not to introduce any further schemes, other than the existing Molineux Match Day scheme and the scheme around New Cross Hospital. The main reason for this is that, during previous consultations the number of residents in favour of such schemes fell well short of what would be required to make a scheme viable. This forced a decision not to implement further permit parking schemes.</i></p>

Date Received	Issue Raised	Number of (Valid) Signatories	Responsible Officer	Status and Action Taken
				<p><i>You should also bear in mind that, whilst potentially limiting the number of vehicles parking on Leicester Street, a parking permit scheme would not guarantee that every vehicle with a permit would find space on Leicester Street. It is possible that parking would still be over-subscribed, and it may be very frustrating for some drivers who will have paid for a permit, but still cannot park on the road of their choice. Alternatively, we would have to limit the number of permits per household, which again is highly likely to be unpopular.</i></p> <p><i>Your petition also asks for the length of Leicester Street, between Gloucester Street and Staveley Road to be made 'one way' to traffic. Our experience in traffic management suggests that making a road one way will inevitably increase traffic speeds. This results from drivers knowing that there will not be any opposing vehicles to be present. This could be exceptionally dangerous on a road such as Leicester Street, where cars are parked on the road, potentially hiding pedestrians – particularly small children – from drivers who may not be able to stop if someone stepped out into the carriageway. I have examined the collision record for the area and there have been no personal injury accident collisions on Leicester Street in the last five years. This, as you will appreciate, is an excellent record and certainly not one that we would want to risk changing.</i></p>

Date Received	Issue Raised	Number of (Valid) Signatories	Responsible Officer	Status and Action Taken
				<p><i>Another issue to making Leicester Street one way to traffic would be to substantially increase the amount of traffic on other local roads, particularly Gloucester Street. It may also lead to a corresponding increase in traffic speed on those roads as drivers try to make up time that they have lost in their diversion.</i></p> <p><i>Given the details I have outlined above, and whilst I am aware that this will be disappointing for you, I cannot uphold your requests made within the petition at this time.</i></p> <p><i>We will, however, keep the situation on Leicester Street and the surrounding streets under review and consider whether any interventions are required in the future.</i></p>
22 June 2021	<p><b>Save Stockwell House Grade Two Listed Building Located in a Conservation Area</b></p> <p>Requested the Council to take appropriate action to ensure the owner completed all outstanding maintenance. This should be actioned and all work completed prior to any Planning Permission Application be considered for the</p>	234	Ian Holliday, Section Leader (Planning)	<p>Status – Closed</p> <p><b>Summary:</b> The Lead Petitioner was advised that the Council had served a notice under section 215 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 on 6 July. This required the property owner to carry out essential work to Stockwell House and the associated cottage by 10 November. The list of essential repairs and maintenance were outlined in the lead officer's response.</p>

Date Received	Issue Raised	Number of (Valid) Signatories	Responsible Officer	Status and Action Taken
	future development of the grounds of the listed property for housing.			<p><b>Full Response:</b>  <i>I am writing to you in response to your petition, which was formally received on 22 June 2021. The petition, which gained 234 valid signatures, was as follows:</i></p> <p><i>“We the undersigned now demand that the Council take all appropriate action to ensure the owner completes all outstanding maintenance. This should be actioned and all work completed to any prior Planning Permission Application be considered for the future development of the grounds of the listed property for housing.</i></p> <p><i>The last occupant of Stockwell House died some years ago in a property understood to be owned by his daughter since the 1980's. For some years now, the property and adjoining cottage have remained empty and subject to vandalism and burglaries as they fall into deterioration. As a Grade Two listed property, it is the responsibility of Wolverhampton City Council's Conservation Department to ensure the property is maintained to a high standard to meet all requirements and this has not been actioned to date.</i></p> <p><i>Several local residents have contacted the Council over the years about this property but no action appears to have been taken thus far.”</i></p>

Date Received	Issue Raised	Number of (Valid) Signatories	Responsible Officer	Status and Action Taken
				<p><i>As the Section Lead for Planning, I hold responsibility for investigating the issues you have raised and responding to your petition. My response is set out below:</i></p> <p><i>On 6th July a notice was served on the property owner, under section 215 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, requiring the following work to be done to Stockwell House and the associated cottage, by 10th November.</i></p> <p><b>Stockwell House</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. Remove all damaged rendering to the external elevations and replace all missing/removed rendering with render which matches the existing in texture, materials and repaint with exterior paint system, in accordance with manufacturer's instructions.</i></li> <li><i>2. Repair all damaged window frames and surrounds and replace any broken windowpanes, using materials that match the existing in size, form and texture.</i></li> <li><i>3. Remove all flaking paint from brickwork repair and replace missing and damaged bricks, using materials that match the existing in size, form and texture. Repaint the brickwork with exterior paint system, in accordance with manufacturer's instructions.</i></li> </ol>

Date Received	Issue Raised	Number of (Valid) Signatories	Responsible Officer	Status and Action Taken
				<p>4. <i>Cut back all vegetation from the building's fabric and treat the root system with herbicide. Allow to die back before removal.</i></p> <p>5. <i>Repair and repaint the double gates and gateposts fronting onto Danescourt Road with exterior paint system, in accordance with manufacturer's instructions.</i></p> <p>6. <i>Clear all vegetation and debris from all gutters. Overhaul all existing gutters and downpipes. Replace all defective and missing components in materials to match existing. Reinstall all rainwater goods to appropriate falls. Replace and fix, as necessary, to ensure complete discharge of rainwater from the building without leaks.</i></p> <p>7. <i>Repair front boundary wall using materials that match the existing size, form and texture and repaint with exterior paint system, in accordance with manufacturer's instructions.</i></p> <p><b><i>Detached cottage fronting onto Danescourt Road</i></b></p> <p>1. <i>Remove all boards that have been placed on the building's frontage including those covering the windows, door and gate.</i></p> <p>2. <i>Repair all damaged window frames and surrounds and replace any broken windowpanes. Repair any damage to the front door and side gate. Use materials that match the existing in size, form and</i></p>



Date Received	Issue Raised	Number of (Valid) Signatories	Responsible Officer	Status and Action Taken
				<p><i>texture. Repaint with exterior paint system, in accordance with manufacturer's instructions.</i></p> <p><i>3. Cut back all vegetation from the building's fabric and treat the root system with herbicide. Allow to die back before removal.</i></p> <p><i>4. Clear all vegetation and debris from all gutters. Overhaul all existing gutters and downpipes. Replace all defective and missing components in materials to match existing. Reinstall all rainwater goods to appropriate falls. Replace and fix, as necessary, to ensure complete discharge of rainwater from the building without leaks.</i></p>
5 November 2021	<p><b>Grapes Pool; "Moseley Road Open Green Space".</b></p> <p>Requested the Council to retain the green space described as Moseley Road Open Green Space, also known locally as "Grapes Pool Fields", at the junction of Moseley Road and Prouds lane in the ward of Bilston North.</p>	3	Luke Dove, Strategic Assets Manager	<p>Status – Closed</p> <p><b>Summary:</b> The Lead Petitioner was advised that the site had been initially included within the Draft Black Country Plan which was currently subject to public consultation.</p> <p>The Lead Petitioner was advised that a petition would only be needed if the site was included in the final draft, which was currently unknown.</p> <p><b>Full Response:</b> <i>Thank you for your petition in relation to the retention of Moseley Road Open Space, also known as Grapes Pool Field, as a green space.</i></p>

Date Received	Issue Raised	Number of (Valid) Signatories	Responsible Officer	Status and Action Taken
				<p><i>The site has been initially included within the Draft Black Country Plan which is currently subject to public consultation. Until such a time that the outcome of this consultation is known, I am unable to advise if the site as detailed will be approved in principle for future development and will form part of the final plan to be adopted. Once the outcome is known and dependent on whether the above named site is included in the final version, it would be at this point a petition of the nature as submitted on this occasion could be actioned effectively. If it is not included for future development on the final version then there would be no requirement for the same.</i></p>
9 November 2021	<p><b>Petition for the installation of a gate between the West end of Penn Fields Parish graveyard and Bradmore Recreation ground</b></p> <p>Requested the Council to install a proper gate and opening between St Philip's (Penn Fields) graveyard and the Bradmore Rec.</p>	81	Luke Dove, Strategic Assets Manager	<p>Status – Closed</p> <p><b>Summary:</b> The Lead Petitioner was advised that following a site visit, the Council agreed to the gate being installed, subject to certain criteria being met.</p> <p><b>Full Response:</b> <i>I am writing to you in response to your petition, which was formally received on 9 November 2021. The petition, which gained 81 valid signatures, was as follows:</i></p>

Date Received	Issue Raised	Number of (Valid) Signatories	Responsible Officer	Status and Action Taken
				<p><i>“We the undersigned would like Wolverhampton City council to install a proper gate and opening between St Philip’s (Penn Fields) graveyard and the Bradmore Rec.”</i></p> <p><i>As the Strategic Asset Manager, I hold responsibility for investigating the issues you have raised and responding to your petition. My response is set out below:</i></p> <p><i>Further to our recent site meeting, I would like to confirm the following actions in relation to the proposed gate and path adjoining Bradmore Recreation Ground and St Phillips Churchyard. In principle the Council agrees to the gate being installed subject to the following being undertaken:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• New path in churchyard to be constructed to required specification as supplied by Dave Millington – Green Spaces and Bereavement Manager – and to adjoin to existing. This is to be undertaken and funded by the Church.</i></li> <li><i>• Cost for gate to be added to existing palisade fence as well as signage, lock and new path in park costs to be obtained by Dave Millington and forwarded to Councillor Sweetman for consideration for ward funds.</i></li> </ul>

Date Received	Issue Raised	Number of (Valid) Signatories	Responsible Officer	Status and Action Taken
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Councillor Sweetman to advise if works can be funded and if approved, notify Dave Millington so that these can be instructed.</li> <li>• Luke Dove to arrange and pay for cut back/lift of overhanging tree once the above is approved.</li> <li>• Formal agreement to be put in place detailing gate locking/unlocking times and that this will be the responsibility of the Church to undertake daily. This will be drafted by Luke Dove once funds have been confirmed for gate/path works.</li> </ul> <p><i>I hope this summarises the position as discussed and confirms the previous gate to the rear of the tennis courts is to remain closed indefinitely.</i></p>
26 November 2021	<p><b>Save East Park</b></p> <p>Requested the Council to improve various facilities within East Park.</p>	52	City Assets, Health & Wellbeing, City Environment & Housing Officers	<p>Status – Closed</p> <p><b>Summary:</b> The Lead Petitioner was advised that the Council would review the facilities in East Park following a public consultation next year.</p> <p><b>Full Response:</b> <i>I am writing to you in response to your petition, which was formally received on 26 November 2021. The petition, which gained 52 valid signatures, was as follows:</i></p>

Date Received	Issue Raised	Number of (Valid) Signatories	Responsible Officer	Status and Action Taken
				<p><i>“We the undersigned would like to see better facilities for the East Park in particular but not limited to:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. The paddling pool regenerated and brought back into service as soon as possible either in the same design or as a splash pad.</i></li> <li><i>2. We would like also to see further investment in East Park for young people &amp; adults following a consultation.</i></li> <li><i>3. We would like to see the public toilets open for longer hours as well as an improved pavilion building with a proper café and facilities, as well as more and varied public city events.”</i></li> </ol> <p><i>Firstly, I’d like to start by saying that East Park is a hugely important community amenity which serves local residents, and we are keen to see it thrive for the benefit of local people. City of Wolverhampton Council is committed to investing in facilities and is also keen to ensure that any new facilities are as inclusive as possible and accessible to all throughout the year. If the pandemic has demonstrated one thing, it’s that our green and open spaces are essential to the well-being of people in our local communities.</i></p> <p><i>In order to be able to respond to your points, your petition was sent to colleagues within various services at the Council – namely City Assets, Public Health &amp; Wellbeing and City Housing &amp; Environment – to</i></p>

Date Received	Issue Raised	Number of (Valid) Signatories	Responsible Officer	Status and Action Taken
				<p><i>examine the matters your petition concerns. Their responses are set out below:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. With regards to the decommissioned paddling pool and ideas for potential investment for other possible facilities in East Park, Council officers have been working with local Councillors to launch a major consultation and engagement programme to seek local residents' views on improvements to the park. This started on 8 December 2021 and finishes on the 30 January 2022. We will ensure that the responses to your petition are included within that ongoing consultation.</i></li> <li><i>2. The consultation will use both quantitative and qualitative methods including a household survey, which will be delivered to one-fifth of households in the area. There will also be online and paper surveys, to which anyone can respond.</i></li> </ol> <p><i>Respondents will be asked for feedback on what they would like to see Council funding spent on in East Park, with a number of options including investing in a paddling pool or a splash pad, or other community facilities. The results of this consultation will be available in March 2022.</i></p>

Date Received	Issue Raised	Number of (Valid) Signatories	Responsible Officer	Status and Action Taken
				<p>3. <i>Events in East Park are being considered as part of a five-year event strategy. However, the mineshafts in the park will always limit the scale of activities that can be hosted there, unless the mineshafts themselves are addressed. However, the Council has recently expanded the number of events in the park for young people as part of its YO! Summer Festival and will continue to do so.</i></p> <p>4. <i>The café was previously let to a tenant; however, this agreement finished in 2021. Any prospective organisations can seek to establish an agreement with the Council to operate the café.</i></p> <p>5. <i>With regards to the toilets, these will unfortunately only be available during times when there is a Ranger presence on site at the moment. Current resources do not permit seven-day opening but we endeavour to keep them open for as long as we can - resources allowing. We will also look at the feedback from the consultation as this could be something we look to secure future additional funding for.</i></p>
14 December 2021	<p><b>Safety of Compton Residents</b></p> <p>Requested the Council to install security lighting for the safety of local residents who use the</p>	215	Dave Millington, Green Spaces and Bereavement Manager	<p>Status – Closed</p> <p><b>Summary:</b> The Lead Petitioner was advised that there was no capital funding identified for installing lighting on the</p>

Date Received	Issue Raised	Number of (Valid) Signatories	Responsible Officer	Status and Action Taken
	pathway joining Martham Drive to the children's playground and the Compton shopping area.			<p>open space but that the petition would be considered further after consultation with stakeholders.</p> <p>An on-site visit would also be organised between the Green Spaces and Bereavement Manager and the Lead Petitioner.</p> <p><b>Full Response:</b> n/a (Private Correspondence between Lead Officer and Petitioner)</p>
15 January 2022	<p><b>Parking on Dixon Street</b></p> <p>Requested the Council to stop large vans, trucks (15 ton), transit type vans and cars, from parking on the pavement and road outside of 160-168 Dixon Street, Wolverhampton, WV2 2BG.</p>	11	Nick Broomhall, Service Lead – Traffic and Road Safety	<p>Status – Closed</p> <p><b>Summary:</b> The Lead Petitioner was advised that the Council was awaiting potential new legislation from the Department for Transport that would provide local authorities with increased civil powers to enforce against footway and verge parking where it is deemed inappropriate. The Lead Petitioner was advised to forward any photographs of the pavement parking so that the Council could assess the extent of the issues raised and keep them on file for when the enhanced civil enforcement powers are introduced.</p> <p><b>Full Response:</b> <i>Your twelve-signature petition regarding the above dated 15th December 2021 has been passed to me as Service Lead Traffic and Road Safety for consideration</i></p>



Date Received	Issue Raised	Number of (Valid) Signatories	Responsible Officer	Status and Action Taken
				<p><i>and response in accordance with City of Wolverhampton procedures for petitions with fewer than 2,499 signatures.</i></p> <p><i>Unfortunately, I am unable to locate any previous correspondence to my team from yourself regarding parking issues in front of 160-168 Dixon Street, as set out in your petition.</i></p> <p><i>Pavement and verge parking is commonplace, not only in Wolverhampton but across the entire country. The simple fact is that there are too many cars and not enough space to park them all within the curtilage of properties. Many motorists believe that they are helping traffic flows by parking partly on the footway, however this is usually at the detriment to pedestrian passage. The width of the carriageway in front of 160-168 Dixon Street is approximately 10.5 metres which is exceptionally wide for a road of this type. I am therefore puzzled as to why drivers should feel the need to park partly on the footway, as they should be able to park wholly within the carriageway without effecting traffic flows.</i></p> <p><i>Existing laws on pavement parking are complex and difficult to enforce unless there is a pavement parking order in place. It is illegal to drive along a footway unless accessing a property with an approved access</i></p>

Date Received	Issue Raised	Number of (Valid) Signatories	Responsible Officer	Status and Action Taken
				<p><i>and it is illegal to park on the footway if full obstruction is evident. These offences are enforceable by West Midlands Police only. However, in reality both of these offences are difficult for the Police to enforce against as they need to be on-sight and witness the contravention firsthand.</i></p> <p><i>We do have a few pavement parking orders on roads in the city; however, the approved criteria for these to be introduced includes the stipulation that all properties must have off street parking available, something that numbers 160-168 Dixon Street are not afforded. Furthermore, we would only consider introducing such a scheme along a significant length of road where pavement and/or verge parking is prevalent. Observations suggest that pavement parking is not commonplace along the residential sections of Dixon Street.</i></p> <p><i>The only other option available to the local authority at this time would be the introduction of double yellow lines along this section of Dixon Street. This would prevent parking on the entire highway (carriageway, footways and verges) and would mean that residents and visitors to properties would also lose the ability to park their vehicles on-street. This is unlikely to be supported by all residents. Removal of the parking may also result in issues for St Martin's church who are</i></p>

Date Received	Issue Raised	Number of (Valid) Signatories	Responsible Officer	Status and Action Taken
				<p><i>likely to utilise on-street parking in Dixon Street for weddings and funerals.</i></p> <p><i>On a more positive note, we are awaiting potential new legislation from the Department for Transport that would provide local authorities with increased civil powers to enforce against footway and verge parking where it is deemed inappropriate. This is similar to those powers already in place across London. Unfortunately, due to the Covid 19 pandemic, this legislation has been delayed in coming forward and we currently do not have a date for when it will be introduced.</i></p> <p><i>In the meantime, I would be grateful if you could forward any photographs you have of the pavement parking so that my team can assess the extent of the issues you raise and keep on file for when the enhanced civil enforcement powers are afforded to us.</i></p>
14 March 2022	<p><b>Halal Store</b></p> <p>Requested the Council to change the usage for 334 Glentworth Gardens WV6 0SN, to be a halal shop to meet the needs of the Muslim community.</p>	150	Harpreet Kaur, Estates Officer	<p>Status – Closed</p> <p><b>Summary:</b> The Lead Petitioner was advised that the change of usage had been denied, citing the potential of repeat goods being sold, and that it violated clause 14.4 of the lease.</p>

Date Received	Issue Raised	Number of (Valid) Signatories	Responsible Officer	Status and Action Taken
				<p><b>Full Response:</b>  <i>I am writing to you in response to your petition, which was formally received by Democratic Services on 15 March 2022. The petition, which contained 150 valid signatures and 19 supporting letters, was as follows:</i></p> <p><b>“We, the undersigned, want Wolverhampton City Council to change the usage for 334 Glentworth Gardens WV6 0SN to be a Halal shop to meet the needs of the Muslim community.”</b></p> <p><i>As the Estates Officer, I hold responsibility for investigating the issues you have raised and responding to your petition. My response is set out below:</i></p> <p><b>Background</b>  <i>The Council granted a lease of the premises, dated 9 May 2016, to Mr Shah. The Lease contained a clause at 14.4, explicitly stating that the lease was granted solely on the basis that the shop only sold electrical items.</i></p> <p><i>On 25 November 2021, the lease was assigned to Ms Bibi on the basis that the shop would continue to only sell electrical items. Prior to the assignment of the lease being approved, Ms Bibi informed the Council</i></p>

Date Received	Issue Raised	Number of (Valid) Signatories	Responsible Officer	Status and Action Taken
				<p><i>that she wanted to change the use of the premises to allow groceries and Halal foods to be sold at the shop.</i></p> <p><i>334 Glentworth Gardens forms part of a parade of three shops, with the other two being a takeaway and a grocery/newsagent/off-licence shop respectively.</i></p> <p><i>Aware that this change of use would more than likely repeat goods sold by the Council's existing tenant, the Council therefore consulted with Mr Bhatia, the owner of the other shop, who raised concerns regarding the proposed change of use of 334 Glentworth Gardens.</i></p> <p><i>Mr Bhatia felt that, if granted, the change of use would duplicate products that he already sold and would therefore be detrimental to his business. Other residents also raised concerns over the proposed change of use. Given the objections and conflict of use, the Council refused a change of use for 334 Glentworth Gardens.</i></p> <p><i>Ms Bibi then informed the Council that she wished to take on the lease of 334 Glentworth Gardens with no change of use to clause 14.4, as the store would only sell electrical products and DVD's. Prior to the completion of the assignment of the lease, Ms Bibi called the Council stating that she was thinking of changing the premises into a car showroom and may</i></p>

Date Received	Issue Raised	Number of (Valid) Signatories	Responsible Officer	Status and Action Taken
				<p><i>pursue this idea after completion of the assignment had occurred. After completion she informed the Council that she intended to pursue this idea and applied for planning permission for a car showroom, which was refused.</i></p> <p><i>Ms Bibi then returned to her original idea of using the premises as a grocery/Halal food shop. She asked for the Council to review its decision. This was done and the Council's position remains unchanged.</i></p> <p><b>Current Position</b>  <i>Ms Bibi has now submitted a petition containing 376 signatures and 19 letters of support for 334 Glentworth Gardens to be allowed to operate as a Halal Shop. The petition states that "a neighbouring shop is objecting to this even though their products are very different."</i></p> <p><i>Ms Bibi took on the assignment of the lease being fully aware that it was assigned solely for the purpose of selling electrical goods. She now wants to sell Halal foods and argues that this will meet the needs of both the local community and the wider Wolverhampton area as Wolverhampton does not have many Halal food stores.</i></p> <p><i>Ms Bibi states that she would sell:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• Halal foods fresh and frozen</i></li> <li><i>• Halal fresh meat and poultry</i></li> </ul>

Date Received	Issue Raised	Number of (Valid) Signatories	Responsible Officer	Status and Action Taken
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Fresh bread, pastries and naan</i></li> <li>• <i>Fresh fruit and vegetables</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Ms Bibi says in her petition that Mr Bhatia's shop is an off-licence and only sells:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Alcohol</i></li> <li>• <i>Cigarettes</i></li> <li>• <i>Pay Point</i></li> <li>• <i>Some Eastern European foods</i></li> </ul> <p><i>She states in her petition that he does not sell any of the foods that she would sell, as listed above. Other residents have objected to the proposed change of use on the grounds that it would cause parking problems. Ms Bibi disputes these objections saying in her petition that "there is a decent amount of parking available to the shops and there would be no parking disruption to local residents." She states that she would operate a click-and-collect and home delivery service from the premises.</i></p> <p><b>Conclusion</b>  <i>Prior to the assignment of the lease, Ms Bibi informed the Council that she intended to change the use of the premises from that of an electrical retailer to selling Halal foods and groceries. The Council consulted with all concerned and, having listened to objections from</i></p>

Date Received	Issue Raised	Number of (Valid) Signatories	Responsible Officer	Status and Action Taken
				<p><i>Mr Singh at the neighbouring shop and to the concerns of local residents, refused the change of use.</i></p> <p><i>Ms Bibi accepted the assignment of the lease on the basis that she would only sell electrical goods and acknowledged at the time that she could not trade as a grocery/Halal food store from the premises. All the Council's Commercial Leases contain a user clause (at 14.4 in this lease) outlining what the premises can sell or trade as. The purpose of this is to ensure fairness and variety along the parade of shops.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed variation would create a duplication of the existing shop trading on the parade and the user clause within the lease was specifically included to prevent this. Objections to the proposed change of use were received and it was refused. Allowing the assignment and variation of the lease to go ahead after receiving objections could cause potential hardship to the existing grocery shop and result in the owner seeking redress from both Wolverhampton Homes and from the City of Wolverhampton Council.</i></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b>  <i>It is clear that Ms Bibi is bound by the terms of the lease that she agreed to and signed, and which restricts her to only selling electrical goods at the premises. Ms Bibi is clear that she cannot undertake a</i></p>



Date Received	Issue Raised	Number of (Valid) Signatories	Responsible Officer	Status and Action Taken
				<p><i>successful business at the premises selling electrical goods.</i></p> <p><i>A way forward is for the Council to grant a variation of the lease to allow Ms Bibi to sell halal meats and halal bakery items and to refuse sale of general grocery, halal foods fresh and frozen, fresh fruit and vegetables.</i></p>
31 March 2022	<p><b>Dog Café</b></p> <p>Requested the Council to support the setup of a Dog Café to protect dog owners.</p>	0	Isobel Woods, Head of Enterprise	<p>Status – Closed</p> <p><b>Summary:</b> The Lead Petitioner was privately contacted by officers in the Enterprise team and offered business support and advice. Information on start-up loans was also sent.</p> <p><b>Full Response:</b> n/a (Private Correspondence between Lead Officers and Petitioner)</p>
27 April 2022	<p><b>Objection to the Proposed Mast on Codsall Road</b></p> <p>Requested the Council to oppose the proposed mast on Codsall Road due to it being an eyesore.</p>	0	N/A	<p>Status – Rejected</p> <p><b>Summary:</b> The Lead Petitioner was advised that the petition could not be accepted as it did not contain any valid signatories. The Lead Petitioner was advised that signatories would need to also provide a postcode for their signature to be valid and counted.</p>

Date Received	Issue Raised	Number of (Valid) Signatories	Responsible Officer	Status and Action Taken
				<b>Full Response:</b> n/a (Petition was rejected)