

Clifton-upon-Teme Section 106 Working Party

Draft Minutes of Meeting dated 18 07 19 - held at the Pavillion 7pm

Present:

Julie Collins – (JC) Working Party – Parish Council Representative
Chris Hurley – (CH) Working Party
Heather Hurley – (HH) Working Party
Jerry Johns – (JJ) Working Party
Helen Wain – (HW) Working Party

together with:

John Bowden (JB) – Chair, Clifton upon Teme Parish Council
Mark Hammond – (MH) Contracts and Development Manager, Malvern Hills District Council
(responsible for receiving and considering S106 applications)

Apologies:

Tony Dipple – (TD) Working Party

The purpose of this meeting was:

- a) to introduce the Chair of the Parish Council (PC) and the members of the Working Party (WP) to Mark Hammond – MH had already been provided with a copy of the S106 WP objectives (approved by the PC 6.6.19)
- b) to have a general discussion of potential projects and the way forward

Once the introductions had taken place, MH addressed the question on everyone's minds, ie the sums involved for Section 106. MH advised that the following monies had been received by Malvern Hills District Council (MHDC), which were specifically for the parish of Clifton upon Teme:

The Meadows (Lovell's)	£243,987.86
The View (HCT)	£ 38,456.70
Total	£282,444.56

These monies, held by MHDC, may accrue interest which would be to the benefit of Clifton upon Teme.

JB advised that the current PC had not received formal confirmation of these sums from MHDC and MH agreed to provide him with a copy of the letter.

In response to a query by JJ, MH confirmed that these figures could be publicised once formal confirmation had been received by the PC.

With regard to other planned housing developments, MH advised that the monies from the Hope Lane development, if planning permission is approved, would largely be in support of Clifton upon Teme, as the development's proximity to the village would have the greater impact and would include surrounding parishes to a lesser extent.

There would also be monies from the Church House Farm development if/when this went ahead.

The S106 monies from these two developments could be used later on to further develop an existing S106 project or for new projects. Applications can only be submitted in respect of monies already held by MHDC.

MH advised that details of S106 monies are available on the MHDC planning portal. He also pointed out that the trigger point for developers to pay over the monies varied.

To a question from CH regarding 'pooling', MH confirmed that this practice no longer applied.

CH suggested apportioning the funds on, say, an 80% 20% basis with 80% earmarked for a very large project and 20% reserved for smaller individual projects. MH said that such a strategy is encouraged and referred to similar strategies at other parishes.

The way forward would be to continue with the community consultation process to suit the various projects, whether large or small. This could be via online surveys and/or leafleting etc to confirm that the proposed plans meet the community's needs. We also have the undoubted advantage of the Adopted Neighbourhood Plan which already contains a 'wish list'.

To a query from CH regarding the possibility of a combined project involving the primary school, MH said this could only be done if the facilities provided to the school were open to the community as well as the school.

HW asked if the school's S106 monies could contribute to a community project, but MH felt this was unlikely as Worcester County Council (WCC) prefer the education S106 monies to be used for specific school assets.

CH then enquired whether school safety issues regarding the road would be eligible, to which MH replied that this was a matter for the Highways Department and the PC could approach MHDC and WCC on these issues.

CH also raised the issue of parking on the village green (VG), which JB then elaborated on as a potential early project. MH's response was that eligibility would depend on what the VG would be used for. The application would need to justify how putting bollards/deterrents on the VG would increase activities there, eg to put on more community events. The application would also need to show how this would enable the village to do things on the VG that currently we might not do. HW suggested more strategically placed benches in addition to bollards. Extra planters were also suggested as a means of deterring parking.

JB referred to the inadequate village notice boards on the VG and shared his thoughts on what type of maps etc would benefit walkers and others visiting the village.

MH suggested that JB put in an application now for the VG, justifying how putting bollards etc on the VG would increase activities there and how improved notice boards would promote activities in and around the village, with the aim of getting people more active – 'active travel'. Also, an improved walking network would benefit older people. The application should demonstrate how improvements would benefit the different ages of the community.

The issue of disability provision was raised and while MH will explore accessibility further, he felt disability would not be funded as a single project. However, any project would need to be compliant with the Disability Discrimination Act (now the Equality Act 2010). It would also help if some of the funding was provided from elsewhere, eg from local fundraising, contribution in kind etc.

Discussion took place in respect of examples of smaller projects now being considered, eg the church's 'quiet space'. This project was briefly outlined and which might include the need for CCTV on the grounds of safety. MH advised that CCTV had been funded in Upton upon Severn for the new play area, where they have installed two multi-use games areas (MUGAs). MH suggested it would be worth visiting Upton to have a look at their completed project.

Other possible projects could include a 'trim trail', including outdoor adult fitness equipment every so often along the trail and/or extension to buildings (if capacity justified).

MH was keen to point out that maintenance of any completed project would need to be recognised as an ongoing responsibility of the applicant and should be demonstrated within the application even though it is not a fundable cost.

Project management was raised – MH said this was a grey area. Any project would need to be put together by the applicant, seeking product supply and installation data from potential contractors and any necessary planning permission. They will often provide drawings and feasibility studies to support the

processes involved in putting the application together. When all costings are to hand, this is the point at which an application can be created. It is possible that consultancy fees to manage a large project could be included in such an application.

Issues such as outdoor lighting for MUGAs was discussed, but everyone recognised that the benefits arising from a 'dark village' should not be lost.

MH emphasised the importance of using appropriate terminology to gain the best support of MHDC in meeting their stated objectives. Key phrases from MH included: 'driving up participation', 'growth in sport team numbers' (re improved changing facilities), 'getting people more active', 'more people can use it', 'increase activities', 'doing something we can't currently do'.

JB asked MH for examples of what MHDC would be looking for in respect of public consultation. MH suggested:

- PC consultation is desirable
- Presentation in Village Hall
- Consult representatives from all organisations – ask them to canvas their members
- Online surveys – simple questions regarding proposed projects – eg agree/disagree
- School assembly – take pictures/plans to elicit responses from pupils
- To any negative response, eg 'its boring' – ask what would make it not boring
- Engage with all user groups
- Bring up at PC meetings
- Use Teme Triangle publication and website
- Leaflet drop, signposting to website or paper copies
- Ask shop, Church and Lion to hold paper copies of questionnaires etc
- Facebook
- Nextdoor.co.uk

MH also informed the meeting that wherever the projects are sited the 'site owner' has the responsibility for the application and delivery and ongoing maintenance. So, for example, if the main project were to be centred on the playing fields, which is a parish asset, then the PC should be the project manager.

JB and JC asked whether projects could be submitted without the PC signing off. MH confirmed that while this is possible, they would expect the PC to have been informed/involved prior to submission. Such project co-ordination/communication planned by the PC, via the WP, should help the process of transparency.

There being no further questions, MH was thanked for taking the time to come and discuss matters with JB and the WP. MH recognised that as we develop S106 projects there may be more questions, to which he will be happy to respond.

The meeting closed at 8.30 pm.