

**BOURNVILLE VILLAGE TRUST  
LAWLEY VILLAGE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**



**Minutes of the Lawley Village Management Committee  
Meeting held at the Oak Tree Centre, Lightmoor Village,  
on Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2018 at 09.15 a.m.**

**PRESENT:**

Benedict Croft (Chair), Fleur Hemming (Acting Secretary), Alison McKittrick, Caroline Fowler–Wright, Roger Wilson, Jim Weir, Ellen Rose.

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Peter Richmond, Becci Youlden, John Haywood, Yvonne Davies (Independent Consultant) Jill Holland - (minute-taker).

**VISITING TRUSTEES**

Adrian Allen.

**OBSERVERS**

Jayne Greenaway (Lawley & Overdale Parish Council).

**125 APOLOGIES**

Tony Kimber, Helen Gordon, Rob Sullivan, Steven Kelly, Keir O'Leary.

**126 DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

None.

**127 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> June 2018 having been circulated, were noted to require several amendments:

**Minute no.116 Surplus on account** – the Committee requested that the minutes reflect their agreement of Option C.

**Minute no 116 Stewardship Report** - Alison McKittrick requested that the minutes stipulate which transfer of land took place in Lawley. It was confirmed that more courtyards would transfer into BVT's ownership.

Following these amendments, the minutes were **APPROVED**.

**128 MATTERS ARISING**

**Minute No. 47/85/98/117 – Review of Covenant Enforcement**

John Haywood advised the Committee that work to finalise the Design Guide is still ongoing with the Resident Representatives and will continue as part of the working group.

## 129 2019 BUDGET

John Haywood presented the report (**copy filed with the minutes**).

John Haywood advised the Committee that the main decision that needed making, other than the budget itself, was the setting of the charge. If it is kept at the same level, then Officers predict there will be a surplus. John Haywood outlined the options available to the Committee.

The Committee discussed the Budget. John Haywood advised the Committee that the Wear & Tear Fund and the Community Fund would be £516,000 this year, including interest.

Jim Weir questioned how the interested was calculated and reminded the Committee that Resident Representatives have previously requested details of the interest in previous meetings. Becci Youlden confirmed that going forward, Officers will provide the base rate from the finance team.

Jim Weir further went on to remind the Committee that it was agreed at the previous meeting that members would receive an Operations Budget. He also requested that members have the accounting details of the Wear & Tear Fund. The Committee agreed for the details to be circulated with the minutes every year. In addition, Becci Youlden reassured the Committee that it will be included on the first financial report for 2019.

Adrian Allen questioned the £516,000 and whether it included the surplus. The Committee raised further questions regarding the additional £70,000 and the Community Fund and voiced their concerns that the figures did not correlate. As a result of the discrepancies Adrian Allen requested that clarification on the figures be provided after the meeting. The Committee agreed.

Caroline Fowler–Wright queried what the Community Fund was used for, to which John Haywood explained that it was used for projects that benefit the community in Lawley Village. There have been several applications this year. The fund is not for large capital projects such as community space but rather for smaller applications/grants.

Jim Weir reminded the Committee of one of the primary objectives of the Village was a community space in the centre of Lawley. This would be a place where all residents could come together. In addition, he believes that this is just as important as a Wear & Tear Fund. The Committee discussed the need to ensure there was enough community assets and how this could be discussed as part of the working groups.

Roger Wilson alerted the Committee to the fact that whilst they were both important, they needed to be kept separate. Jim Weir replied that it was his aspiration that the residents would decide on where the money goes. To which Roger Wilson stated that decisions on the Wear & Tear Fund are regulated by governance and the governance is from the LVMC.

Adrian Allen questioned the s106 of the report and what the contribution of the developer was. Jim Weir advised the Committee that it is currently being pursued outside the Committee and Jayne Greenaway confirmed that there should have been £300,000 for community space.

Jim Weir advised that there should have been a dedicated community facility built in the heart of Lawley. The original site now has the Extra Care facility on it and another site had never been earmarked.

Jim Weir further went on to explain that the Lawley Primary Academy should have been built like the Oak Tree Centre, with the community facilities attached, however, it has not been built to plan.

Jayne Greenaway informed the Committee that the Lawley & Overdale Parish Council have sought advice from their solicitors. It is their opinion that the building should be put back to how it should have been. If not, the developers have used the money and should give it back. Jim Weir informed the Committee that the Lawley Village Community Association (LVCA) is also lobbying on the issues.

Adrian Allen advised the Committee that although it was important issue, it was separate from the need for a decision on the Budgets.

John Haywood referred to the four options and that whilst he was not aware of any other expenditure, it would be prudent of the Committee to remember that the Community Charge remains the same but last year resident's received a refund.

Jim Weir provided the Resident Representatives feedback on the Budget and advised the Committee that the group had been meeting monthly to discuss it. Whilst they were not happy with the details, they did agree with the end result. The Resident Representatives are willing to approve the overall budget and would like to undertake some detailed items to the working groups. Adrian Allen asked whether the residents were in favour on the Budget and what they would like to do with the surplus. Jim Weir advised that they were and that they would like to increase the Community Fund to enable more money to build community facilities.

Roger Wilson reminded the Committee that should the Community Charge be reduced year on year, then eventually it will have to increase and this needs bearing in mind. Furthermore, so far it has only increased in line with inflation. Alison McKittrick added that it was very important to communicate the fact that there had not been an increase in the charge this year.

The Committee discussed the options and agreed that residents would not notice such a small refund. Jim Weir advised that it should be spent on building the Community Fund and that he vehemently opposed spending the money to replace the s106 money that was received by the Telford & Wrekin Council (TWC) from the developers. In addition, the developers are legally obliged to provide community facilities. Roger Wilson agreed with the point and stated that it should be separate.

Adrian Allen advised the Committee that it was important to ascertain what

the community wanted and that they should not have to suffer due to the developers.

Benedict Croft asked the Committee if they agreed the budget in its entirety, to which they did.

The Committee **AGREED on option A**

- a. **Increase the amount allocated in the budget for the Community Fund.** This would increase the size of the fund available for community projects. It should be considered that there is already a budgeted contribution to this fund for 2019. The underspend from 2017 was also added to this fund. To date, less than £2,000 has been allocated from this fund for resident projects.

The Committee **AGREED the 2019 Budget.**

### **130 ALTERATION APPLICATION APPEAL**

John Haywood presented the report (**copy filed with the minutes**).

#### **Appeal 1 – 27 Lineton Close**

John Haywood informed the Committee that Officers did not have an issue with the proposed railings and did not foresee them affecting the character of the area.

The Committee discussed the application and considered whether it was an exceptional case. Roger Wilson advised the Committee that should the appeal be upheld then it was important to revise the Design Guide to ensure that the alteration did not set a precedent, which could be abused in the future.

The Committee agreed that in this circumstance the installation of railings should be permitted.

The Committee **APPROVED the alteration application appeal.**

#### **Appeal 2 – 57 Yewtree Moor**

John Haywood advised the Committee that based on the covenant, which is very restrictive, residents are not permitted to alter or remove walls. However, there is an option to allow the removal under a license.

Jim Weir stated that as the property is located within a courtyard, failing to permit the application is problematic and could cause cars to be parked on the street. He considered the problem to be a design fault and that furthermore, it is incredibly difficult for residents to shut their gates whilst their cars are parked on their driveway.

The Committee discussed the application, including whether the wall had a purpose other than for cosmetic appeal and Benedict Croft raised his concerns regarding the quality of the workmanship should the changes be

made. John Haywood assured the Committee that all alterations are expected to be undertaken to a certain standard.

Peter Richmond reminded the Committee that the key issue was the affect the alteration could have on the character of the Village. Should the property be on the front of the street caution would need to be exercised, however, as the property was in a courtyard, it is hidden away and not in clear sight.

The Committee also considered the fact that some residents may need to apply for adaptations which may evoke equality legislation.

The Committee agreed for the removal of a section of the wall surrounding the entrance to the driveway.

**The Committee APPROVED the alteration application appeal.**

### **Appeal 3 – 22 Wall Close**

John Haywood referred to a previous decision made by the Committee and reminded them that all decisions are governed by the Design Guide, including the covenant that prevents residents from installing satellite dishes to the front of their properties. However, in certain exceptional cases it is not physically possible to install the dish at the rear of the property.

The Committee discussed the need for satellite dishes to be installed as discreetly as possible and in some cases when positioned on ground level, if it is possible to surround them by bushes, grass verges or in a private driveway.

Jim Weir stated that of all the covenants, this was the most controversial as residents feel they are being dictated to by BVT. The Committee acknowledged the changes to SKY services that were expected next year which may affect satellite dishes and could also be expensive.

The Committee discussed the option of permitting the dish to remain in its current position on the condition that the resident confirms that they will make the changes once the service is available. Alison McKittrick was concerned that there may be problems with allowing the time for the technology to change, it may not work and that the decision cannot be based on potential future IT developments.

Adrian Allen reminded the Committee that it needed to be flexible as people live in the houses and reiterated Jim Weirs point that residents feel as if they are being dictated to.

The Committee voted in favour of the application on the caveat that the resident review their contract with their provider at the earliest opportunity.

**The Committee APPROVED the alteration application appeal.**

### **Appeal 4 – 9 Daker Row**

John Haywood informed the Committee that the resident was bound to a contract with the provider and as such would be at a disadvantage if the

satellite was removed. However, there may be the option to change the position.

John Haywood referred to the second photo and informed the Committee that the resident had identified two other properties where the dish was not at the back of the dwelling but had been given consent for the application.

Jim Weir questioned why the two applications had been agreed when they clearly conflicted with the Design guide. John Haywood replied that consent was granted by a former Officer who had now left the organisation and at the time had not consulted with the Estates Team before making his decision. Jim Weir believed that in doing so has caused a domino effect.

The Committee discussed alternative locations and types of satellite dishes that would not contravene the Design Guide.

Roger Wilson suggested that the application appeal be refused and that Officers work with the resident to find a suitable location. In addition, Officers should also examine the two neighbour's dishes.

**The Committee REJECTED the alteration application appeal.**

#### **Appeal 5 – 39 Higgs Row**

John Haywood referred to the application and informed the Committee that the residents wished to create an additional area of hardstanding, which currently consisted of gravel. Officers believe that the application was made to simply aid the turning of vehicles and not for additional parking.

The Committee discussed the feasibility of the application in accordance with the Design Guide and felt that permitting the application could create parking issues elsewhere in the Village as it would set a precedent.

Caroline Fowler-Wright queried how much of the area was in question, to which Fleur Hemming confirmed it was along the resident's boundary. In addition, by parking a second car (as seen on the photograph) in a specific location, meant that the residents were unable to access their driveway.

The Committee agreed that the Design Guide is clear with regards to not allowing the creation of further hardstanding.

**The Committee REJECTED the alteration application appeal.**

## **131 DESIGN GUIDE**

John Haywood presented this report (**copy filed with this minute**).

John Haywood informed the Committee that the attached was a base document which will be used by the working group following the Lawley Refresh meeting.

Furthermore, Jim Weir advised that it was a living document and was the

first one resident's had had full input into and will continue to do so going forward. It was also considered a means by which residents could protect their amenities.

Caroline Fowler-Wright queried the charge for commercial signs and if there were delays in invoking the charge, whether the house could be sold before the process is accelerated. To which Jim Weir confirmed that it would not be a case of seeking money, more by way of encouraging residents to conform. Alison McKittrick agreed that it should be in the main document.

John Haywood acknowledged that it was a work in progress with further extensions required in the covenants and breaches, however, he was confident that this would be achieved through the working group.

**The Committee APPROVED this report.**

## **132 WINTER GRITTING**

John Haywood presented this report **(copy filed with this minute)**.

John Haywood explained the current procedure, in that the grit has never been intended to be used on the road, only the courtyards and that Officers understood that residents who did not have a courtyard felt aggrieved that they had no grit.

Therefore, there are several options available for the Committee to consider. The first being a full gritting service, which would be conducted to a high standard. The second would be to consider whether grit is provided if the roads are not cleared and finally, if the courtyards continue to be gritted, should BVT restrict the number of bag provided? Last year the grit was misused and it is not feasible to continue to provide that level of service again.

Peter Richmond stated that it was evidently an emotive issue and was conscious that there was not a great deal of time to discuss the matter. Jayne Greenaway added that with limited road adoptions within the Village, safe routes to the school need to be taken into account.

Alison McKittrick reminded the Committee that this was the third time the item had been brought to the meeting and that it was important to manage resident's expectations.

John Haywood advised that the Telford & Wrekin (TWC) Snow Warden Scheme had not really progressed as it relied on volunteers and perhaps this was something that could be taken to the Lightmoor Village Community Association (LVCA).

Adrian Allen commented that it was currently the responsibility of the developers and once the roads were adopted, would fall within the remit of TWC. In addition, Lawley Village was no different to other estates on this issue.

Jim Weir disagreed and explained that Lawley Village was different in that it was a stewarded estate and residents question what they pay the Community Charge for.

Fleur Hemming informed the Committee that BVT staff were subjected to a considerable amount of abuse last year as some residents failed to understand that the grit is solely for the courtyards.

Roger Wilson proposed that the procedure remain the same as last year with the grit bins being filled with a specific amount and for the LVCA to make the decision. If BVT provide a full gritting service then residents will have to pay for it, to which the Committee agreed.

Benedict Croft confirmed that the policy needs to be clearly communicated to residents and needs to be undertaken as soon as possible.

**The Committee NOTED the report.**

### **133 RESIDENT FEEDBACK PROGRESS REPORT**

Fleur Hemming presented this report **(copy filed with this minute)**.

**The Committee NOTED this report.**

### **134 STEWARDSHIP REPORT**

Fleur Hemming presented this report **(copy filed with this minute)**.

Fleur Hemming advised the Committee that the Community Team was currently finalising its Christmas programme. There are a wide range of activities for residents to attend and get involved in.

John Haywood provided an update on the courtyards and that by the end of the year BVT will have ownership of most of the courtyards in phases 3, 4 and 6. By spring 2019, BVT will be working with the developers to identify open spaces ready for transfer. Ellen Rose states that she hoped residents would see a difference in the courtyards and questioned what improvements would be made. John Haywood advised that the areas would be brought up to a level in accordance with BVT standards and attention would be given to improving flower beds, painting of furniture, etc. In addition, it was necessary to understand that BVT would be making improvements and not correcting the defects made by the developers.

Becci Youlden asked the Committee if they thought it would be valuable to receive a map of Lawley Village with future reports. The Committee agreed that they would find this useful.

Roger Wilson queried the Eileen Hewer fund and Fleur Hemming provided a brief explanation as to how the fund was established following the passing of one of the original Resident Representatives and how the fund was set up to assist Lawley residents with community projects.



**The Committee NOTED this report.**

### **135 FINANCIAL REPORT**

John Haywood presented this report **(copy filed with the minutes)**.

Roger Wilson identified a discrepancy with the staffing costs to which Becci Youlden confirmed that this would be corrected after the meeting.

Ellen Rose queried the anomalies referred to in the report and John Haywood advised that these were due incorrect apportionments made by the Finance Team but assured the Committee that they would be reflected in the report for the next meeting.

The Committee requested that Officers re-issue the financial report prior to the distribution of the minutes.

Ellen Rose questioned what was meant by £10,000 being set aside. John Haywood confirmed that this was separate from the Eileen Hower Fund and would solely be used for community projects, thus it should be placed in the Community Fund.

**The Committee NOTED this report.**

### **136 KPI REPORT**

Fleur Hemming presented this report **(copy filed with the minutes)**.

Jim Weir asked the Officer's how happy residents were with the service provided by BVT and why hadn't a customer satisfaction survey been distributed for three years. Becci Youlden replied that the details requested from the developers differ slightly to those contained within the BVT survey, which was originally undertaken every year but had now been changed to every three years.

Jim Weir continued that Resident Representatives had made requests for an operational report, which should contain numbers of breaches, response times, etc and a report on the service standards, to illustrate whether BVT are adhering to the KPI's within the contract. In addition, he was disappointed that despite reassurances made to the LVCA that they would be involved with the survey, this has not been forthcoming.

Peter Richmond responded by stating this was a valid point and that BVT had not paid as much attention to the KPI's as they were not requested by the developer. However, moving forward and with the introduction of the working groups, he was confident this was assist the process.

The Committee acknowledged that residents become frustrated and need to understand what service BVT provide and that it was vitally important up remain open and transparent.

Becci Youlden assured the Committee that it was never intended to not provide the information, however, there has been a lack of resource to undertake the surveys and the developers have shown very little interest in the results.

**The Committee NOTED this report.**

### **137 LAWLEY VILLAGE OPERATION RISK ASSURANCE REPORT**

Fleur Hemming presented this report **(copy filed with the minutes)**.

The Committee were informed that a copy of the dashboard would be provided to every meeting.

Caroline Fowler-Wright questioned how the Poor Financial Performance was given a score of 9 but had a risk target score of 6. Becci Youlden confirmed that she would examine this outside the meeting and provide an answer.

**The Committee NOTED the report.**

### **138 LAWLEY REFRESH MEETING**

Jim Weir presented this report **(copy filed with the minutes)**.

Jim Weir provided a brief background on the LVCA and began by informing the Committee that one year ago the association became reactive following resident's unwillingness to participate. The Resident Representatives have attended monthly meetings which has not only led to more engagement but has also enabled the attendees to identify what needs to improved.

In addition, Jim Weir acknowledges the work undertaken by BVT Officers and appreciates the fact that they have given up many of their Saturdays to attend the joint meetings.

Jim Weir provided an outline of the Lawley Refresh Meeting and referred to how there had been a dramatic shift in relations since Pete Richmond's appointment. In addition, whilst there would still be challenges ahead, he was confident that the Committee was now in a more positive place as a result of trust building.

Roger Wilson welcomed the comments and advised that BVT need to be clear of their scope and equally residents need to understand what BVT can and cannot influence.

Pete Richmond agreed with the points that had been made and wanted the role of Stewardship to be clear, including the financial aspects.

**The Committee NOTED the report.**

**139 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Roger Wilson requested that in future the location of the meeting should be included on the reports.

Ellen Rose requested that some Committee meetings take place on a Saturday as Resident Representatives work and may not always be able to obtain time off work. The Committee agreed to look at the dates for next year.

**140 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

To be confirmed.

.....  
Chair

.....  
Secretary

.....  
Date