

## **Area East Annual Parish & Town Council Meeting Summary of Issues Raised – For information**

*Assistant Director:* Helen Rutter, Communities  
*Service Manager:* Helen Rutter, Area East Development Manager  
*Lead Officer:* Helen Rutter, Area East Development Manager  
*Contact Details:* [helen.rutter@southsomerset.gov.uk](mailto:helen.rutter@southsomerset.gov.uk) or (01963) 435012

### **Purpose of the Report**

To inform Members of the topics discussed and the issues raised at the Annual Parish and Town Council Meeting

### **Public Interest**

All Area East residents are represented at the local level by their Parish Councillors. Issues that are not within their direct control can be taken up with the District Council, County Council and other public service organisations. This Annual Meeting covered topics of interest to Parishes and this year had a focus on planning, environmental work and a community led social enterprise

### **Recommendation**

That the report be noted.

### **Background**

Each year the Area Committee hosts an Annual Parish Meeting. This enables the District Council to share information about topics we know to be of interest to parishes. It also enables parishes across Area East to come together to discuss locally important issues and raise matters of concern with the District Council. The Area East Committee receives a summary of the event with any issues raised and actions taken arising from the meeting.

### **The Event**

This was hosted at Churchfield on Tuesday 26 January 2016. Half an hour was allocated before the meeting started to enable informal discussions with Officers and invited drop-in guests from other services, including Streetscene, Development Control and Area Development.

The event was well attended with 18 Parishes represented (36 people), 8 District Councillors and 7 SSDC/Agency staff present. Cllr Nick Weeks welcomed Parishes.

- Feedback helps us to making best use of our AEC resources and setting priorities for the coming year.
- Parishes were asked to fill out the feedback forms about the service, that had been sent out the previous week
- A further survey would be sent out looking for details of any empty workshops or offices premises, not currently in occupation, in order that we could work with owners to bring these back into use.

The Area Development Manager outlined some of the pressures facing SSDC and its communities during the period of prolonged austerity by the Government. She highlighted that SSDC has to find a further £4m of budget savings over the next 3 years as rate support grant disappears. This is a good time for parishes to work with other local authorities to take

more control over locally important assets and services to protect and enhance community life. SSDC is open to ideas and proposals from parishes. She went on to explain the roles of the individuals within the team and the specialisms and patches within which they worked.

### **Chris Cooper, Street Scene Manager – Street Scene work**

- Chris explained the wide scope of the service and the specialist facilities, resources and services that they provide. The overall service costs in the region of £1m to provide and he is keen to provide additional services, such as the Parish Ranger service to parishes, who wish to purchase extra help to tackle local priorities. His team is happy to work with volunteers for clean-up campaigns etc.
- He is hoping to extend the community payback into every Parish in the District to supplement the workforce in getting environmental works done
- He asked for Parishes to nominate Parish Wardens as a direct link, as these eyes & ears on the ground are very helpful for targeting work that is a local priority

### Q&A session:

- *Ilchester PC – have a significant problem with dog excrement, fly tipping in the Pilbridge Lane area, waste left by recycling vehicles and a destroyed waste bin in The Mead, how is it replaced?*
- There is an enforcement team who can go out to particular areas where there is a need, run a campaign and do some educational work. Replacement waste bins are the responsibility of the Town or Parish Council – his team is charged with emptying the ones that are in approved locations. With all fly tipping it's important to register an accurate report and his team will get round to it as quickly as possible. He is in close contact with Somerset Waste Partnership but the problem here is about the design of the waste collection boxes and the ability of lightweight waste to blow out of the back of lorries. It is an extensive problem and he would welcome Parishes giving their own feedback to Somerset Waste Partnership.
- *Castle Cary TC – asked if there were any schemes such as 'Key Britain Tidy' to help generate pride in the environment by the wider population.*

Chris reported that a 'Clean for the Queen' initiative is due to start shortly but at any point in time they will come out and support a local campaign and there are numerous communities that make use of this service.

Another Parish mentioned that a dog charity can offer a complete campaign pack for tackling and educating dog owners and she would find the link and send this to Castle Cary.

- *Ansford PC – requested a link to Chris to discuss issues in the Parish.*  
Chris agreed that he would give his direct dial contact number to anyone who wanted it and this would also be noted in the minutes that are circulated from the meeting. (Tel No: 01935 462840; Email: [chris.cooper@southsomerset.gov.uk](mailto:chris.cooper@southsomerset.gov.uk))
- *Keinton Mandeville PC – thanked Chris for the very helpful staff that clean in the village. They feel they get a great service.*
- *Bruton TC – enquired about a programme for cleaning litter from rural roads.*

This takes place in the winter when the rubbish is easier to see and prior to the weed killing programme that starts up in the spring. They were currently working across the District from West to East to clear litter from rural roads. If, however, there is a particular hotspot then please contact the team direct for some targeted work.

- *Charltons Parish – flagged up a problem that they have with the growth of weeds at the corner of 2 roads, which creates a safety hazard for drivers.*
- This would be addressed in the spring through the weed clearing programme and direct contact welcome about specific locations.

### **Resourcing your project Tim Cook and James Divall, Neighbourhood Development Officers**

- Slides were used to highlight some of the key points to consider when parishes are seeking to deliver a successful project. The NDOs can help parishes navigate through all the permissions required from SSDC, advise of funding sources and help them to access specialist help

### **Paul Wheatley, Principal Spatial Planner & David Norris, Development Manager Section 106 and CIL**

The presentation was given, key points included:

- SSDC is the charge Authority for CIL and will collect all CIL contributions and administer the scheme when it's adopted
- The introduction of CIL has been delayed by priority being given to the adoption of the Local Plan. Now this is complete CIL consultation will start shortly with a view to adopting it this autumn
- CIL is payable on commencement with phasing for larger developments to ease cashflow. This means the money is obtained more quickly than many 106 payments
- No decision has been taken about how the monies received will be distributed to important infrastructure projects, however, anything on the Regulation 123 list will not be eligible for Section 106 monies
- All onsite infrastructure will still be dealt with through 106 Agreements
- Parish & Town Councils will receive 15% of the CIL tariff; if they have adopted Neighbourhood Plan they will receive 25% of the tariff raised in their area

Q&A session:

- *Charlton Horethorne PC – “is CIL payable for adopted Community Plans?”* No.
- *Keinton Mandeville PC – “where there is an outline planning permission and detail has yet to be granted, will CIL become payable?”* By and large if there is a 106 Agreement signed & sealed then no CIL will be payable, however, on some larger developments where there is phasing over several years then CIL may be payable on some of the later stages. There will be a transition period and in some instances there may be a renegotiation during this period.
- *Castle Cary TC – “your slides say that CIL is designed to enable future development – this gives us concern when 106 money was about mitigating the impact of approved development. Are CIL payments only allowed for enabling future development? What are the parameters?”* 106s were designed to mitigate the impact of development, however, the regime that we have adopted in recent years has moved beyond the strict remit of what was envisaged and so, under the new regime, 106s will be used for very specific essential infrastructure. The CIL payments made to Parishes will be ring-fenced to specific additional infrastructure that can mitigate impact and enable further suitable development.

In reference to a further question it is anticipated that if all the stages are passed successfully then it will come into force autumn 2016. Also there is an expiry period on Parish CIL payments of 5 years.

*Cllr Wallace asked if there was benchmarking with regard to charging regimes in neighbouring areas to make sure that we didn't set our tariff too high and inhibit development? Officers reassured everyone that the CIL tariffs in adjacent areas are set higher than what is being proposed in South Somerset.*

*Cllr Lewis expressed concern that due to the nature of the Up Mudford development this will be excluded from the CIL regime and therefore there would be no benefit for the Parish of Mudford, within which most of the development will occur. It was clarified that the needs of the development at Up Mudford will be covered through an extensive 106 Agreement, as there are massive infrastructure costs associated with major greenfield sites such as this urban extension.*

- *Ansford PC – asked if “development will be affordable if there is some charging for 106 and CIL on the same development?” Officers clarified that CIL is not retrospective.*
- *Ilchester PC – will 106 or CIL fund all of the infrastructure required? Officers confirmed that this is not the case. It won't fund all of it, however, it will be match funding for schemes that can be funded and supported through other pots such as government funding grants, etc. S 106 money is for very specific works, which are pre-agreed at the approval stage.*

*Cllr Groskop commented that infrastructure in places like Bruton with very narrow roads, can never be resolved and the traffic generated creates a significant problem with no real prospect of a proper solution. If the impact of a scheme is great in terms of the traffic impact and the limitations of the roads, then this should be taken into account and a planning permission should not be granted.*

### **Eric Russell, Kingsdon Community Shop – Running a successful social enterprise**

This was an inspirational story about a whole village effort to recreate a social hub after the village school closed. The shop and café was made possible by SCC granting a 25 year peppercorn lease on the old school building. The shop has exceeded all expectations and over 10% of the village are volunteers. The tea room is the focus and numerous events have run and are planned.

The community have ambitious plans to expand the shop and tea rooms. They commented that the help of the NDO had been invaluable in navigating through the planning system and helping raise the cash required.

### **Feedback on the event responses**

Abbas & Templecombe PC

*“Help with Village Hall improvements without support work may not be able to go ahead”*

*“Highlights the importance of the Area system and the need to understand the importance of our rural communities”*

Ansford PC

*“An example of a Development would be helpful”*

Barton PC

*“It could be improved with more time”*

Castle Cary TC

*“Very friendly event, thank you”*

*“All very helpful, no need to improve”*

Charlton Horethorne PC

*“Nothing could be improved, shame more people didn’t attend – they missed out”*

Henstridge PC

*“Nothing could be improved, shame more people didn’t attend – they missed out”*

Wincanton TC

*“Could be improved by use of microphones for speakers”*

Note:

Out of 15 feedback forms handed in, 8 rated the evening ‘good’ and 7 ‘excellent’

All 15 agreed the content was ‘relevant’

7 have responded to the ADT survey, 8 have not

There were 5 *new* Parish/Town Councillors

## **Future Events for Town and Parish Councils**

An Annual Parish & Town Council Meeting is held in each of the 4 Areas. In between times the Area teams arrange other workshops and events for Parishes depending on need. Parishes enjoy a close working relationship with their Ward Councillors who will discuss and advise on how to take up matters of local concern. In addition they receive agendas for and are warmly invited to attend the monthly Area East Committee meetings where they can raise any topics of interest or concern to their residents.

## **Financial Implications**

There are no new financial implications as a direct result of this report

## **Corporate Priority Implications**

*This meets the following Corporate Aim:*

- *To deliver well managed cost effective services valued by our customers*

## **Carbon Emissions & Climate Change Implications**

## **Equality and Diversity Implications**

**Background Papers:** *Notes of the Area East Annual Parish & Town Council Meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> January 2016;*