

Special Advisory Group

Minutes - 2 May 2017

Attendance

Members of the Special Advisory Group

Cllr Andrew Johnson (Chair)
Cllr Mary Bateman
Cllr Roger Lawrence
Cllr Elias Mattu
Cllr Rita Potter
Cllr Paul Singh
Cllr Wendy Thompson

Employees

Dereck Francis	Democratic Services Officer
Martyn Sargeant	Head of Democratic Services

Part 1 – items open to the press and public

Item No. *Title*

- 1 **Apologies for absence**
Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Cllrs Milkinder Jaspal and Stephen Simkins.
- 2 **Declarations of interests**
No declarations of interests were made.
- 3 **Minutes of the previous meeting - 17 March 2017**
Resolved:
 That the minutes of the meeting held on 17 March 2017 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.
- 4 **Matters arising**
There were no matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting.
- 5 **Community Governance Review Update**
Martyn Sargeant, Head of Democratic Services presented the update report on activity since January 2017 on the community governance review and on the next steps in the review process.

Cllr Andrew Johnson reported that the review was progressing well and that the public consultation meetings had been well attended. He also drew to the Advisory Group's attention the costs for the review which would be funded from the budget set aside for the review in 2017/18.

Cllr Wendy Thompson asked about the questions that would be included in two separate surveys, one for Tettenhall and one for the wider city as part of the community governance review. Cllr Andrew Johnson asked the Head of Democratic Services to circulate a copy of the survey questions to members of the Advisory Group.

Members of the Advisory Group commented on the need to provide every resident of the City of Wolverhampton with sufficient accessible information to make them aware of the pros and cons of the parish council governance model in order that they could make an informed decision if they are asked to vote on such a proposition. Cllr Andrew Johnson reported that residents had been provided with a lot of information on the options.

Resolved:

1. That the costs of the review be approved.
2. That the arrangements for the survey fieldwork be noted.
3. That the changes to the timetable for delivering the review be noted.
4. That a copy of the survey questions be circulated to the members of the Advisory Group.