

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Full Council of Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council
held on Tuesday 14 October 2025 at 6:30pm at The Sambrook Centre, Stirchley**

Present: Cllrs T Wood (Chair), C Addison, J Anderson, A England, C Lloyd, J Malcolm, Z Mandela, M A Salifu, G Sinclair, T Skidmore, S Vaughan-Hodkinson, A Watkin, T Wust

In Attendance: C Maclean (Locum Clerk/RFO)

Police: PCSO T Uttley (Brookside), PCSO J Wall (Brookside), PCSO C Ellis (The Nedge), PCSO J Stubley (The Nedge)

Members of Public: 6

FC/25/141 ELECTION OF CHAIR OF COUNCIL

Cllr T Wood opened the meeting noting the requirement for the election of a Chair of Council for the remainder of the year. This was following a decision by Cllr C Lloyd to stand down as Chair of Council.

Cllr T Wood expressed her interest in assuming the Chair role.

Proposed by Cllr J Anderson, seconded by Cllr G Sinclair that Cllr T Wood be Chair of Council.

Cllr S Vaughan-Hodkinson expressed her interest in assuming the Chair role.

Proposed by Cllr S Vaughan-Hodkinson, seconded by Cllr C Lloyd that Cllr S Vaughan-Hodkinson be Chair of Council.

Cllr S Vaughan-Hodkinson presented her case for being appointed Chair of Council.

Cllr T Wood presented her case for being appointed Chair of Council.

Councillors agreed to undertake a secret ballot.

Cllr T Wood was adopted as Chair of Council by a majority vote.

Councillors noted the Declaration of Acceptance of Office to be signed by Cllr T Wood.

Cllr G Sinclair expressed his apologies and left the meeting at 6:36pm. A resident left the meeting at the same time.

FC/25/142 WELCOME

Cllr T Wood welcomed everyone to the meeting.

FC/25/143 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies noted from Borough Cllr N Page.

FC/25/144 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr A England noted with Cllrs his membership of the Planning Committee at Telford & Wrekin Council. Cllrs noted that Cllr A England would not participate in any discussions relating to planning items within this meeting.
No other declarations declared.

FC/25/145 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

A resident raised concerns over the anti-social of electric bikes in the area surrounding the Medical Practice and in Calverhall. It had been noted that a

member of the public leaving the building was nearly knocked over, the situation being heightened due to the bike's silence.

PCSO C Ellis advised that the situation was challenging for them to address as they could not go in pursuit of them. PCSO C Ellis advised some success was being achieved in that where identified homes were being visited and for those bikes being ridden by younger members of the community, parents were disposing of the bikes when advised how they were being used.

Cllrs considered whether other opportunities to educate parents of the risks being taken were possible including flyers being handed out to parents at the local schools.

Cllr J Anderson noted that not all bikes being used in this manner were electric having referred the case of one being filled up at Stirchley Shell station. PCSO C Ellis and J Stubley advised that this case had been followed up and dealt with. Cllrs noted interest from members of the public in the item relating to the Community Governance Review. It was agreed that when the agenda item was reached Standing Orders would be suspended to allow members of the public to participate in the discussion.

FC/25/146 POLICE REPORT

PCSO C Ellis noted with Cllrs the topic of electric and offroad bikes had been covered.

PCSO C Ellis advised Cllrs that cases of homeless and rough sleepers in the underpass and bushes were being addressed.

PCSO C Ellis advised Cllrs of issues being raised by vehicles being driven in an anti-social manner in Stafford Park and that a CCTV unit had been installed to monitor.

PCSO C Ellis advised Cllrs of ongoing issues relating to shoplifting from the Coop store but that a problem solving plan was being put in place. It had been noted that shoplifted items were subsequently being sold in private properties which were being monitored.

PCSO T Uttley noted with Cllrs the removal of the bench and adjoining low level brick wall at Brindleyford in attempt to address anti-social behaviour in that area.

PCSO C Ellis reminded of the need to report all incidents to Police to enable them to identify the hotspots.

Cllr T Wood expressed thanks on behalf of the Council for the hard work being done by the Police across the parish.

FC/25/147 MINUTES

To Approve the Minutes of the Full Council Meeting on 9 September 2025.

Proposed by Cllr J Anderson, seconded by Cllr T Wust and it was unanimously resolved by all those present at the meeting that the Minutes be adopted and the Chair sign these as a true record.

The 4 Police representatives left the meeting at 6:55pm.

FC/25/148 MATTERS ARISING

Cllrs noted the paper presented by the Locum Clerk relating to the proposal to acquire laptops for the Council. Cllrs noted that Council had previously agreed their acquisition on consideration of the budget for 2025/26 at the meeting of 21 January 2025.

The Locum Clerk advised Cllrs that withdrawal of support for the Windows 10 platform would result in two of the desktops in the Council offices subsequently failing to operate. Extensions of support for up to 12 months to other units in the office had been established but in view of the age of the current laptops consideration was required to replace these also.

The Locum Clerk also advised Cllrs that use of the current computers was restrictive and with a couple of exceptions meant the Council could not offer flexible working arrangements.

Cllrs noted the quotes provided and the Locum Clerk proposed the purchase of 14" laptops.

Proposed by Cllr T Wust, seconded by Cllr J Anderson and it was unanimously resolved that the Locum Clerk be authorised to purchase up to five 14" laptops at a unit price of £810.00 plus VAT with potential total cost of £4,050.00 plus VAT.

No other matters were raised.

Recognising the next agenda item and interest of the members of public Cllrs considered the suspension of Standing Orders.

Proposed by Cllr S Vaughan-Hodkinson, seconded by Cllr C Lloyd and it was unanimously resolved that Standing Orders be suspended for the duration of the next agenda item.

A member of the public joined the meeting at 7:00pm.

FC/25/149 TELFORD AND WREKIN COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW

Cllrs noted the third consultation round of the Community Governance Review and the proposal by Telford & Wrekin Council to divide Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council; specifically the proposal to place Stirchley within Hollinswood and Randlay Parish and place Stirchley Village and Stirchley Park within a separate Brookside Parish.

Cllrs noted the feedback also shared by and between Cllrs expressing their concerns and opposition to the proposal. Cllrs noted that implementation of this proposal would undermine established community identity, reduce local government effectiveness, create unnecessary financial burdens and is in opposition to local opinion.

Cllr T Wood shared Cllr T Wust's observation that Telford & Wrekin Council appeared to be going against the views of the Local Boundary Review Commission when in 2023 it was proposed and agreed that polling district TTT should move away from Brookside and enter The Nedge ward. In light of the previous adjustments Cllr A England stated his view the Parish Council should be left as it is.

Cllr T Wust advised Cllrs of the strong views expressed by residents of Stirchley Village and Stirchley Park where they recognised their identity under Stirchley and not Brookside. Cllr A Watkin shared similar concerns.

Cllr S Vaughan-Hodkinson expressed serious concerns over the stance of Telford & Wrekin Council and questioned whether they were following their own criteria.

A member of the public advised Cllrs of concerns over whether there had been any consideration given to the cost of impact of the proposal. The member of the public also shared the view that vulnerable members of the community would not travel to adjoining areas for support which is currently offered at The Sambrook Centre in Stirchley.

Cllr T Wood shared concerns over the council tax bands of properties in Brookside and the impact on future tax demands as the funding of a separate Brookside Parish would require a substantial amount of Precept.

Cllr T Wood enquired of Cllrs whether there was any support for the proposal put forward by Telford & Wrekin Council. None was offered.

Cllr C Lloyd noted the proposed new government funding for Brookside but considered that it should not be used to maintain a Parish Council. Cllr A England noted that to date no details on priorities had been provided on how this central funding would be managed and processed but also stated his view the funding should be spent on the community.

Cllrs noted the strategic and operational differences between the Parish Council and Hollinswood and Randlay Parish Council.

Cllr M A Salifu noted that identities of the communities in Hollinswood and Randlay differed to those of Stirchley.

Cllrs noted the paper presented to Council setting out the potential risks to current services and offerings provided by the Parish Council. Cllrs noted this could impact (i) The Sambrook Community Centre; (ii) Youth Provision; (iii) Environmental Services; (iv) Play Areas; and (v) Community Events.

Cllrs noted the statement by Telford & Wrekin Council that the recent spate of Cllr resignations merited the review. Cllrs disagreed with the statement, noting that the Parish Council was now at a stage of continuous improvement including community engagement.

The Locum Clerk was requested to forward the contact details at Telford & Wrekin Council to Cllrs to enable those Cllrs who had not responded to date to do so.

Proposed by Cllr T Wust, seconded by Cllr S Vaughan-Hodkinson and it was unanimously resolved that the Parish Council oppose the Community Governance Review proposal by Telford & Wrekin Council on the following terms.

At a meeting of Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council on 14 October 2025 Council UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED TO OPPOSE the proposal by Telford & Wrekin Council under their Community Governance Review to divide Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council; specifically, the proposal to place Stirchley within Hollinswood and Randlay Parish and place Stirchley Village and Stirchley Park within a separate Brookside Parish.

The following points detail the reasons why the Parish Council believes that the correct course of action is to remain as its currently exists and allow the Parish Council to continue delivering ever improving services and offerings on an equitable basis to the residents of Brookside, Holmer Lake and Stirchley.

This submission sets out the reasons why such a change would undermine established community identity, reduce local government effectiveness, create unnecessary financial burdens and in opposition to local opinion.

1. Community Identity and Interests

Stirchley and Brookside has functioned as a shared community for decades, bound by common facilities, services, and a shared sense of belonging. Residents of both areas use and identify with the same schools, library, shops, post office, sports fields, youth facilities and community centres – the majority of which are based in Stirchley Centre but serve the entire parish effectively. These are not simply service points, but genuine community hubs that foster social interaction, belonging and cohesion across both neighbourhoods.

Youth provision offers a particularly strong example of this shared identity. Programmes such as FunZone bring children and families together from across Stirchley and Brookside and their success depends on a unified parish structure. A separation would risk undermining this provision, fragmenting funding and governance, and ultimately disadvantaging young people in both Stirchley and Brookside who currently benefit from shared youth resources.

Geographically, Randlay Avenue forms a clear, long-established physical boundary between Stirchley and Randlay. This boundary reflects genuine differences in community identity. Stirchley residents do not naturally look to Hollinswood or Randlay for their local facilities or sense of belonging. Similarly, Hollinswood operates as a wholly separate community, with its own facilities, playing fields, shops and community centres that Stirchley residents neither use nor identify with. There is no practical or social link that justifies merging the two. Stirchley Village and Stirchley Park residents strongly identify with Stirchley, not Brookside. Placing Stirchley Village and Stirchley Park within Brookside would erase that distinct identity and force residents to identify administratively with an area they do not live in, undermining the community's integrity. That erasure would totally undermine the history of Stirchley Village and Stirchley, which has been a parish since the 1200's. It should be noted that should Stirchley Village and Stirchley Park be placed within Brookside it would be the third time since the early 2000's which is considerable totally unacceptable to residents. As stated, residents of Stirchley Village and Stirchley Park do not associate themselves with Brookside and fear that any move to make them become part of Brookside would result in their views and interests being ignored and that the majority of funding would be spent on the part of Brookside within the ring road.

2. Effective and Convenient Local Government

The current parish structure is efficient and well understood by residents. It ensures that local services, facilities and representation are easy to access and it reflects clear, logical boundaries recognised by residents.

Splitting the parish as proposed would create confusion about which council provides which services, risk duplication of administrative functions and potentially disrupt established maintenance responsibilities. It would also be impractical to split polling districts across parish lines. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) concluded in 2023, after extensive consultation and an Act of Parliament, that polling district TTT (formerly TBZ) should move away from Brookside and enter The Nedge ward. To now disregard

those findings would be inconsistent and disingenuous, undermining the integrity of that process conducted by the commission at the request of Telford & Wrekin Council just a few short years ago.

3. Value for Money & Financial Considerations

The current combined parish achieves economies of scale, allowing resources to be shared efficiently and equitably across both Stirchley and Brookside.

Community grants, community interest organisations and youth programmes all benefit from joint management and funding.

If the areas were divided, both parishes may face increased administrative and staffing costs, duplicated governance structures, and reduced capacity to deliver community projects. It would also be unreasonable for Stirchley residents' council tax precepts to subsidise Hollinswood facilities they do not use.

With significant housing development planned on The Hem, the responsibilities for maintenance, play areas, bus stops (17 of 25 within Brookside), and community spaces will only increase, requiring strong, unified local governance rather than fragmentation and confusion.

4. Local Support

There is no evidence of local demand for this change. On the contrary, local opinion is overwhelmingly opposed. During recent canvassing for the Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council elections in August 2025, a subsequently successful candidate encountered widespread opposition to both the previously proposed *Nedge Parish Council* (since rejected) and to the idea of merging Stirchley Village and Stirchley Park into Brookside. Residents consistently express pride in living in Stirchley and a desire for their identity and representation to reflect that fact.

It is therefore clear that the proposal does not have community support and, if implemented, would generate significant opposition.

5. Potential Risks to Current Services and Offerings

The proposal throws into doubt the following services currently provided by Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council to residents of Brookside, Holmer Lake and Stirchley:

a. The Sambrook Community Centre, Stirchley

The building incorporates (i) community library; (ii) hub for social, recreational and educational activities; (iii) activities by groups including arts and crafts, short mat bowls and other wellbeing-focussed sessions; and (iv) hub for support organisations providing counselling and advice services to the community.

Adding another building to those currently maintained by Hollinswood and Randlay Parish Council questions the sustainability and viability of the Stirchley centre. Closure of the centre would remove a key amenity for the community for groups as well as support organisations working within the local community. Vulnerable members of the community will not wish to travel to other parish buildings.

b. Youth Provision

Provided by the FunZone team within the Parish Council through the last 20 years. The youth offerings are delivered through The Sambrook Centre in Stirchley and the Brookside Central Community Centre. Question arises over

the possibility of delivering these under a split environment. The Parish Council's approach towards youth provision in Stirchley and Brookside is strategically different to that of Hollinswood and Randlay Parish Council. The success of the provision by Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council is reflected in increasing numbers of youths attending and benefitting from the offerings.

Membership numbers as at September 2025 were:

- i. Brookside at 118 (commenced November 2024);
- ii. Stirchley midweek at 242;
- iii. Stirchley Saturday at 230 (commenced April 2024).

Key to success of this provision is down to a well-trained and dedicated team living within and knowing the community and not solely relying on third party organisations who have no local investment. The combined offering enables young people to come together from differing elements from the community and improve social interaction.

Fragmentation of this provision runs serious risk of loss of team members heavily invested in improving the wellbeing of young people. Loss of this provision would run risk of increase in anti-social behaviour, an area where the local Police have noted improvements.

The Stirchley FunZone offering is dependent upon the Stirchley centre as its hub.

c. **Environmental Services**

The services provided by Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council differ in approach to those of Hollinswood and Randlay Parish Council.

Stirchley and Brookside's services cover:

- i. **Gardening scheme** for eligible residents. Currently stands at 84. Question over how this could continue as operating model differs to Hollinswood and Randlay Parish Council.
Implementation of the proposal would result in 40 properties being in scope of Brookside Council. Recruitment of an operative to deliver in Brookside would add to costs. Relying upon volunteers runs separate risks. For those properties in Stirchley, risk is the service not continuing at the level currently provided or at all.
- ii. **Bus stops** maintenance. 17 of the 25 stops are located within Brookside.
Separate future maintenance within Brookside would add to costs.
- iii. **St James Church graveyard** part of which is maintained by the Parish Council.
Future responsibility would fall to Brookside.
Future maintenance would add to costs. Relying upon volunteers runs separate risks.
- iv. **Stirchley allotments**. If integrated into Hollinswood and Randlay question arises whether the new Council would wish to maintain two separate sites.
- v. **Stirchley and Brookside roundabout**; half in Brookside, half in Stirchley.
Separate future maintenance costs would increase.
- d. **Play Areas**. Maintenance of the 5 play areas owned by the Parish Council would fall under the responsibility of Brookside.
Future maintenance of these would add to costs.

e. **Community events.** Would these continue and be viable if the current parish is split? Current events see residents from Brookside, Holmer Lake and Stirchley all participating.

Residents in Stirchley may not wish to travel to Hollinswood or Randlay for events and vice versa if event held in Stirchley.

6. Councillor Membership

The statement is made that “the recent spate of councillor resignations from Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council may be considered to indicate that the arrangements need to be reviewed.”

Like any other town or parish council councillor membership can evolve. The Parish Council rejects any suggestion that a review is required as a result of recent resignations which were for varying reasons.

The recent vacancies showed strong interest from parishioners in representing their community with three of the four positions being filled through the election process and the fourth via co-option. It can now be seen that with new membership the Parish Council is increasing its engagement with the community.

CONCLUSION

The proposed reorganisation is unnecessary, divisive and inconsistent with the principles of community identity, effective governance, and value for money that underpin the Community Governance Review process. Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council has a long, successful record of joint working, shared services, and community cohesion. Splitting it would deliver no identifiable benefit and would instead undermine the social, financial and administrative integrity of both communities.

The Committee of the Community Governance Review is urged to reject this proposal and instead retain the existing boundaries of Stirchley and Brookside Parish Council and Hollinswood and Randlay Parish Council.

Following conclusion of discussion on the agenda item Cllrs considered resuming Standing Orders. Cllrs expressed their thanks to the members of the public for their participation and views.

Proposed by Cllr J Anderson, seconded by Cllr T Wust and it was unanimously resolved that Standing Orders be resumed.

FC/25/150 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

a. New Applications

Cllrs noted application TWC/2025/0651 and the proposed erection of a single storey rear extension at 3 Shipton Close, Stirchley. Following consideration Cllrs agreed that no comment be offered.

b. Applications Received Post Agenda Publication

Cllrs noted no further applications had been received.

c. Application Decisions

Cllrs noted no advices had been received from Telford & Wrekin Council.

FC/25/151 CHRISTMAS EVENTS

Cllrs noted the paper presented to Council detailing the three events planned over the Christmas period. These were noted to cover (i) Christmas Cracker Event at The Sambrook Centre on 6 December; (ii) Pensioners Christmas Lunch Party at the Holiday Inn on 11 December; and (iii) Christmas Pantomime at Telford International Centre on 20 December.

FC/25/152 SALC WREKIN AREA COMMITTEE REVIEW

Cllrs noted the draft notes of a meeting of the Area Committee Review Working Group held on 10 September 2025 and shared through SALC.

Cllr S Vaughan-Hodkinson shared concerns with Cllrs over perceived lack of understanding of the document and what was required as feedback.

FC/25/153 MAINTENANCE OF THE SAMBROOK CENTRE

The Locum Clerk advised Cllrs further electrical work was being undertaken within the centre and on conclusion new certificates would be received.

FC/25/154 COUNCILLOR SURGERIES

The Locum Clerk advised Cllrs that concerns were being raised by Brookside Cllrs over the ability to conduct delicate conversations with residents within the open space of the café. Cllr Z Mandela advised Cllrs that on discussing the possibility of using a room in the Brookside Central CIO Community Centre he was advised that this could be done but the Parish Council would be charged the time used.

Cllr C Lloyd advised Cllrs of previous practice where a room at the back of the building had been made available but that it did not work in terms of being visible and accessible to residents.

Cllr J Malcolm advised that he had on occasion had access to a room to enable specific conversations to be conducted. Where required and possible he advised he would endeavour to meet a resident in The Sambrook Centre.

Cllr A England suggested that more discrete conversations could be conducted down the corridor but there was some suggestion over feasibility.

Cllrs discussed options across the three wards and the two centres. Further work was required to understand what provision for surgeries was available between Cllrs and the Locum Clerk would follow up to understand availability.

FC/25/155 SHAUN DAVIES MP CONSULTATION ON £1 MILLION SPEND ON BROOKSIDE

Cllrs noted the consultation currently being undertaken to identify ideas for spending up to £1 million to improve Brookside. Cllrs agreed any funding should improve the community and one area considered was increased car parking facilities.

Consideration was given to how the funding would be managed and whether it would be facilitated by an independent body or Telford & Wrekin Council. Cllrs noted that no answers were available at the current time.

The Locum Clerk advised Cllrs that he and the Environmental Services Officer had met with a resident that day to understand difficulties for people with mobility issues crossing Brookside Avenue. Cllrs noted the matter was being raised with Telford & Wrekin Council.

FC/25/156 RECREATIONAL AND PLAY AREAS

The Locum Clerk advised Cllrs of an email he had received from a resident expressing disappointment and concern over the lack of access to the tennis courts. It had been noted that the courts had been locked up preventing children access and the facility being used.

The Locum Clerk advised Cllrs that he had previously raised the matter with Telford & Wrekin Council who had stated the reasons for the locking up being due to the borough council not wishing to maintain the site and by locking up negated any public liability issues in event of falling on broken glass or dog faeces.

The Locum Clerk advised Cllrs that he would investigate opportunities and costs in relation to improving the site and future maintenance if this enabled the Parish Council to use the facility along with Telford Park School.

FC/25/157 FINANCIAL REPORT**a. Financial Report**

Cllrs noted the paper presented to Council advising of the current status of the Council's finances.

b. Payments Requiring Approval of Council

Cllrs noted the payments required for approval at Council together with payments requiring ratification. Details of all payments set out in the appendix.

Proposed by Cllr T Wood, seconded by Cllr T Wust and it was unanimously resolved that the payments be made and the payments previously made ratified.

c. To consider additional signatory to the Council's main bank accounts

The Locum Clerk advised Cllrs he would defer this item to a subsequent meeting of Council.

d. Note and Approve Bank Reconciliation at 30 September 2025

Cllrs noted the Bank Reconciliation at 30 September 2025 presented to Council.

Proposed by Cllr T Wood, seconded by Cllr C Lloyd and it was unanimously resolved that the Chair sign the Bank Reconciliation on behalf of the Council.

Cllrs expressed appreciation to the Locum Clerk for the work undertaken to bring the financial affairs of Council back into full order.

FC/25/158 BUDGET 2026/2027

The Locum Clerk referred Cllrs to the spreadsheet and notes relating to the budget of the Council for 2025/26 and the income received and expenditure incurred to date. Cllrs were requested to consider what new items or projects they would like to see factored into the budget for the next year.

Cllr C Lloyd suggested the Council factor in a cost for the tennis courts.

Cllrs noted the topic would be discussed at the next meeting of Council.

FC/25/159 BOROUGH COUNCILLOR UPDATES

Cllr A England advised that he still had £500.00 available in his Pride Fund for allocation.

Cllrs expressed appreciation to both Parish/Borough Cllr A England and Borough Cllr N England for their contributions and funding for painting of bus stops within the parish. Cllr T Skidmore suggested including white poppies.

FC/25/160 PARISH MATTERS

Cllrs noted the proposed launch of a new local radio station in February 2026. No other Cllr or parishioner matters were raised.

FC/25/161 NEXT MEETING'S AGENDA

- a. Election of Vice-Chair of Council.
- b. The Sambrook Centre Fees and Charges.
- c. Allotments Fees and Charges.
- d. Budget 2026/27.
- e. Items to be referred to Locum Clerk in advance of next meeting.

FC/25/162 NEXT MEETING DATE

Cllrs noted the next meeting scheduled for 11 November 2025 at 6:30pm at The Sambrook Centre.

FC/25/163 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS & PUBLIC

It is recommended that the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they may involve the likely disclosure of exempt information in relation to any individual, as defined in paragraph 1, and/or information relating to financial or business affairs, as defined in paragraph 3, Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Proposed by Cllr C Lloyd, seconded by Cllr S Vaughan-Hodkinson and it was unanimously resolved that the press and public be excluded from the meeting.

The Chair thanked members of the public for attending and declared the public session of the meeting closed at 8:22pm.

FC/25/164 HUMAN RESOURCE MATTERS

The Locum Clerk presented to Council a paper setting out the current situation relating to the Council's cleaning arrangements with a proposal on how the extended absence of the Council's cleaner could be addressed.

Proposed by Cllr J Anderson, seconded by Cllr T Wust and it was unanimously resolved that the Locum Clerk proceed to find a settlement to close the matter out.

The Chair thanked everyone, declaring the full meeting closed at 8:36pm.

APPENDIX

**STIRCHLEY AND BROOKSIDE
PARISH COUNCIL**

**COUNCIL MEETING 14 OCTOBER 2025:
FC/25/157b**

INVOICES FOR PAYMENT APPROVAL

ID	SUPPLIER	DESCRIPTION	INVOICE NO	NET AMOUNT	VAT	TOTAL
1	Telford & Wrekin Council	Pantomime Tickets	4665493	£814.00	£0.00	£814.00
2	HMRC	Tax & NIC	N/A	£4,003.68	£0.00	£4,003.68
TOTAL				£4,817.68	£0.00	£4,817.68

INVOICES RECENTLY PAID

ID	SUPPLIER	DESCRIPTION	INVOICE NO	NET AMOUNT	VAT	TOTAL	PAID
1	Ex-Forces to Community's CIC	Youth Provision	SI-4	£865.36	£0.00	£865.36	01- Oct
2	Auniqueart	Wall Mural	1000250634	£1,000.00	£0.00	£1,000.00	29- Sep
TOTAL				£1,865.36	£0.00	£1,865.36	

.....
Chair

Date: 11 November 2025