

STOKE ST. GREGORY PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on Monday 8th August 2022

Held in The Williams Hall, Dark Lane, Stoke St Gregory.

Present – Janice Pearce (Chair), Anne Merritt (Vice-Chair), Heather Venn, John Hembrow, Peter House, Ian Upshall, Jason Morgan, Danny James, David Fothergill (County Councillor), Sue Buller (District Councillor)

In Attendance – Kelly de Silva (Clerk) and four members of the public

100. Apologies for absence – Ann Finn, Norman Cavelli (County Councillor)

Declarations of Interests and Dispensations – JH items that include the PCC, AM, items that include the Youth project, IU items that include the SEG.

JP requests the approval of the PC to record the meeting for the purpose of the minutes as the Clerk will be typing into documents as the items are discussed. All were in favour; motion passed.

Public question time – A member of the public is present to offer suggestions on dog fouling. The member of the public informs that as a responsible dog owner and someone which works with dogs, they recognise there is an issue with dog fouling – citing this is nothing new. They inform there are a lot of responsible dog owners and suggest extra signage and a visit from the dog warden is ineffective. They recommend that it should be about education and having conversations with individuals – if perpetrators can be identified they should be approached about it in a non-confrontational manner. They suggest the PC social media and village newsletter can be used to highlight and educate on the issue.

Some recommendations they have for alleviating the issue are if someone is caught out without a dog bag; use leaves in the hedgerows to remove the fouling from the path to the hedge, request dog owners carry extra bags for distribute if required, if you see dog mess – pick it up, or use a stick to push it to the side or hedge.

The Playing Fields is an area were dog fouling issues should be reinforced due to the hazards of toxocarasis and children – but education and having conversations with people is a good start. They state if you live in SSG; you should be expected to clear up after your dog and play your part in looking after the village.

JP thanks the member of the public for their input informing an initiative similar to the green dog walkers' scheme is something the PC are currently investigating which could include some of the recommendations made.

DJ informs he does believe signage will help the issue as it will help to get the message out there and keep the issue in the forefront of people's minds, this can be used alongside a social media campaign. The member of the public would also like to mention the use of the footpath at the back of Broomfield park by cyclists. They are completely opposed to the use of chevrons or urbanisation to combat the issue. They inform SSG is a small village; people know who these children are, and they should be spoken to and educated on the matter.

JP explains this is a health and safety issue that has been reported to the PC by an older member of the community who was almost injured. Education takes time; action on health and safety must be immediate.

The Clerk informs chevrons was only a suggestion within the minutes. The PC agreed and purchased no cycling signs that are awaiting to be put in place. The member of the public requests aesthetically pleasing signs. The Clerk responds they are box standard no cycling signs.

The member of the public raises the topic of the steps that have been installed from the playing fields to the Willey road. They state they are beautiful steps; but the barrier is dangerous, aesthetically urban and someone will hit it.

The Clerk informs the barrier is there for the safety of children not to run out onto the road descending the steps – it is a safety requirement.

JP thanks the member of the public for their contributions.

(One member of the public leave)

A member of the public suggests social media could be used for a campaign designed by the young people of SSG to reinforce the problem and the impact this has on the young people of the village.

101. Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

JP informs for the purpose of the minutes and members of the public an overview of the NALC (National Association of Local Councils) guide to CIL for Parish and Town councils.

JP informs CIL is a charge on a development that came into force in 2010 (and runs in tandem with s106 contributions). The purpose of CIL is to fund provision, improvement, maintenance, and support of infrastructure to support local development.

CIL can be used for a broad spectrum of infrastructure. CIL is paid by the developers to the Local Authority who distribute the parish portion to councils.

JP explains there are regulations attached to the use of CIL.

CIL monies can be used to support the development of the local area to fund:

- a) the provision, improvement, replacement, operation, or maintenance of infrastructure; or
- b) anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area.

(The CIL (as amended) regulations 2010 s59c).

CIL monies cannot be used for everyday TPC (Town Parish Council) expenditure or for items or services which fall outside the TPC's remit (whether that be by statute or Power of competence)

(The Localism Act 2011 Pt 1)

JP reports the CIL can be used for specific projects or for improvement of the village. This investment should be based on the needs of the community and the high priorities of the community to address the demands on local infrastructure the development has placed on the village.

JP continues to assist with identifying gaps and addressing the needs of the village, the PC have been developing a PIIP (Parish Infrastructure Plan). The PIIP will also assist with identifying priorities for infrastructure investments alongside the EOI's (Expressions of interests) submitted by village groups and members of the community, the survey/questionnaire results - which have been further analysed - and the suggestions the community have provided through social media posts.

JP states there is a requirement for the PC to ascertain if the submissions and suggestions fulfil the CIL regulations and that the PC is clear on the regulations stated. All agree.

JP offers a breakdown of the CIL monies the PC is in receipt of;

Broomfield Park development - £64,390.70

The Barn. Woodhill - £907.42

Total - £65,298.12

JP refers back to the CIL regulations citing the key consideration should be "addressing the demands that development places on an area" when discussing the suggestions and EOI's.

Each EOI will be considered carefully to ascertain if it fulfils the criteria of pressures as a result of the housing development.

JP continues that "infrastructure" includes physical, social, and green infrastructure for example, highways; cycleways; education facilities; sports and community halls; parks and play areas.

Examples of how CIL monies have been spent include:

Supporting a town bus service (Henley on Thames)

Ultrafast fibre broadband (Waterstock Parish Council)

Installing village gates on a main road verge to slow traffic (Bix and Assendon Parish Council)

JP informs from the NALC guidance; that to assist with deciding on spending priorities, the community should be consulted to create a list.

Any consultation should be inclusive and meaningful so all demographics of the community can be engaged in the CIL process.

CIL can be used to shape the future of our local area. Also, by engaging with local authorities, contributions to larger infrastructure projects undertaken by District and County Councils could be

considered that would benefit the area in the long-term.

JP reports to assist in meeting this guidance; the PC devised a questionnaire in 2021. There were concerns about the survey reaching everyone within the community – the elderly, the young, the housebound and those who do not have internet access. The PC agreed that a questionnaire was to be delivered to every household in the village; which it was. JP explains the questionnaire was devised by 2 Parish Councillors and agreed in Council. The questionnaires were delivered by hand, there was sufficient time to complete the questionnaire, the completed questionnaires were either collected personally when requested or could be dropped off at one of several collection points arranged throughout the village.

JP continues the PC received a response rate of approximately 16% - that may sound poor, but in the life of Parish councils and local authorities; a 16% response rate is reasonable. JP informs it would have been preferable to have received more responses and maybe the questionnaire could have been done better. The PC has received criticisms over the content and questions within the questionnaire but JP stresses there was a large section within the questionnaire that said ‘other’ for people to add anything they thought could be included and for any other suggestions.

JP informs once the questionnaires were collected, the results were analysed and have again since been further analysed. This was quite a complicated process. Some may criticise the way it was done; but it was done with the best possible motives to establish some of the priorities of the community. These priorities have correlated with other community engagement suggestions to establish the content of the draft PIIP (Parish Infrastructure Investment Plan).

These items included health and wellbeing, leisure and recreation, young people, and the environment.

JP reports last year the PC invited the community to submit Expressions of Interests (EOIs) for consideration of CIL funding. The PC received a few EOIs – they trickled in at a slow pace and the PC was certainly not in any position to make any investment decisions at that time.

JP states here we are now – the PC has received several more EOI’s and many suggestions through social media. The PC has worked towards the draft PIIP to be used as a guideline for establishing priorities and allocation of CIL funding alongside the questionnaire, social media suggestion gathering, and EOI’s.

Contributions to the Parish Infrastructure Plan (PIIP)

JP explains for the purpose of the minutes and members of the public present that the PIIP includes listing services and facilities within the Parish, their condition, location, existing capacity, and catchment area. This includes items such as public/passenger transport, education/schools, open spaces, community and leisure facilities, environment (including waste, infrastructure etc), cemeteries, village/road signage, footway lighting, seats and benches and church yard. It also includes an external infrastructure audit identifying services and facilities outside the PIIP area that are used by the community.

JP asks for any other suggestions to the PIIP.

Please see the attached draft PIIP document for content. The PIIP is dissected section by section to amend as appropriate and agreed for inclusion within the PIIP. This is a working draft document and will be updated regularly until the document is completed.

Within the contributions to the PIIP, there is significant discussion around the MUGA suggestions; MUGA (Multi Use Games Area) Proposal

IU requests for a clear definition of just what a MUGA is and what it would comprise of citing there are different extremes of definitions of MUGA’s with the community possibly expecting more than the CIL funding will allow for. There is a requirement to temper expectations as to what the community want and what can be afforded with CIL funding if there is a will to move forward with such a project.

DJ responds a clear outcome of consulting with the community has identified that a MUGA in the form of a surfaced area with posts/goals and fencing would be preferable as a consideration; but this comes at a considerable cost – much higher than the Parish CIL funding available.

AM informs a tentative quote obtained, just for a tarmac surface and groundworks alone was £32,000,

with specialised goals and posts this can cost £3,000-£4,000 each, with fencing – they can easily cost upwards of £100,000.

DJ suggests that if this project is to be considered, and it is clearly a want for the community, it should go back to the community for further consultation. The project if agreed to pursue, should not be restricted to the CIL funding available. There are grants and funding available. With the development of a Community Plan, the green charter and further consultation, it could assist to bolster evidenced based proposals for applying for funding. DJ states this suggestion is a long play – there is potential to do something spectacular.

AM enquires if there is a possibility of working with the Tennis Club to allow for more inclusive use of the court area for other activities. HV recommends discussions are opened with the Tennis Club should be explored to ascertain.

HV and AM to arrange discussions with the Tennis Club.

DF and SB leave the meeting

Review of Expressions of Interest

JP informs the PC has a comprehensive list of EOI's and suggestions that have been made and submitted by members of the community.

JP recommends each suggestion is viewed considering the following criteria;

Does the EOI/suggestion meet CIL regulations?

- a) the provision, improvement, replacement, operation, or maintenance of infrastructure; or
 - b) anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area.
- (The CIL (as amended) regulations 2010 s59c).

And;

Has the need arisen as a direct result of the housing development as per the regulations.

Each EOI and suggestion is discussed in order and decided if the each EOI and suggestion meets the set criteria and should go through to the next phase of consideration.

| | | |
|---|-----------------------|---|
| The Willowset – purchase and build of a modular building with associated works | £61,467.24 | Since the original submission, the Willowset have independently secured funding for the project |
| HOTV – Contribution to the cost of re-equipping the kitchen | £10,000.00 | HV questions issues pertaining to a business as it is a community benefit. Clerk to seek guidance from the CIL Officer. <i>It was advised it could be considered. The Parish Council would need to satisfy themselves and their local community that the application of CIL funds is appropriate i.e., the improvements benefit the community and would be difficult / impossible to achieve using profit generated by the business. A stage 2 application form to be sent.</i> |
| Women's Institute – Petanque Court at the Village Hall | £2,000.00 | Stage 2 application form to be sent to WI. <i>Provision of recreational facilities meets CIL regs</i> |
| SSG Tennis Club - Floodlighting | £30,000.00 | Declined – not a direct result of the development |
| SSG Tennis Club - Fencing | £6,600.00 | Stage 2 application form to be sent to SSGTC. <i>Meets CIL regs Improvement and replacement of infrastructure</i> |
| SEG – Creating a sustainable and environmentally conscious SSG | £2,500.00 | Stage 2 application form to be sent <i>Meets CIL regs an increase in residents increases local climate impact</i> |
| Member of the Public – Play area at Polkesfield | No Costings submitted | Declined – not a direct result of the development; no land in the area owned by the PC. |
| Member of the public – safe access from the Coates visitor centre to the village square | No Costings submitted | Declined – speed limit introduced and RoW footpath routes available. Road safety to be included in road survey for further consideration |
| Member of the Public – Investment in children and young people | No Costings submitted | Included as part of the Youth initiative |

| | | |
|--|-----------------------|--|
| The Willowset – outstanding works at the setting for a forest school, sensory area, SEN equipment and associated equipment | £7,000.00 | Stage 2 application form to be sent <i>Meets CIL regs</i> |
| Bench Seating along walks on the moors | No Costings submitted | Declined – the PC does not own land on the moors to place benches and it could affect farming and machinery used. Further seating and benches will be considered with the PC, SEG and landowners in due course as provision of infrastructure. |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| SSG Parish Church – footpath works | No Costings submitted | <p>Advice sought from SALC and the CIL officer due to the prohibition in legislation (s8 LGA1894) SALC advised;</p> <p>“There is always the question of whether it’s reasonable to spend public funds on a churchyard when the PCC is already required to do it, and the council should always be alert to the risk (albeit a very low risk) that it could be challenged through judicial review if someone feels strongly enough about the decision.”</p> <p>The CIL officer advised;</p> <p><i>My understanding of this regulation is that CIL funds should be spent to address issues that have specifically arisen as a result of additional people, traffic, pets etc. that are now present within the parish as a result of additional houses that have been built within the parish.</i></p> <p><i>Therefore, the Parish Council needs to be able to satisfy itself, the local community, and the Council that these works within the churchyard are required as a direct result of additional usage by an increased population. The areas of the churchyard benefitting from the CIL funds would also need to be 100% accessible to all members of the public, regardless of faith etc. at all times i.e., this is essentially a public footpath”</i></p> <p>It is discussed by the PC. It is noted the Diocese should be responsible for the maintenance of church property. The burial ground, administered by the PC, can be accessed by the car park. Access from the church car park to the square could be included within a road safety survey. A vote is called by HV. JH abstains due to declaring an interest, 1 for, 6 against.</p> <p>EOI declined as not being as a direct result of the housing development.</p> |
| SSG Youth Project – Play equipment and associated works | £30,000.00 | <p>Stage 2 application form to be sent</p> <p><i>Meets CIL regs</i></p> |
| | Total - £149,567.24 with five submissions with no costings | |

Review of input from social media

FM - Purchase of a 2-4 acre of land to create a community woodland – *A stage 2 application form will be sent via the SEG as it meets CIL regs*

AB – Replacement of fencing and gates at the playing fields play area – *Meets CIL regulations. A stage 2 application form will be sent to the PFMC highlighting issues raised.*

PF – Easy access at the Royal Oak and shop including the function room - *It was advised it could be considered by the CIL Officer as long as the Parish Council could need to satisfy themselves and their local community that the application of CIL funds is appropriate i.e., the improvements benefit the community and would be difficult / impossible to achieve using profit generated by the business. A stage 2 application form sent.*

JT – MUGA – *Included within the Youth initiative plans. A Stage 2 application form sent to the SSG Youth Project for further consideration*

JV – Opening the Hall during winter for people to be warm and comfortable due to increased energy prices – *This does not meet CIL regs, but it will be included in the September agenda for further consideration*

DS – MUGA - *Included within the Youth initiative plans. A Stage 2 application form sent to the SSG Youth Project for further consideration*

LB – MUGA - *Included within the Youth initiative plans. A Stage 2 application form sent to the SSG Youth Project for further consideration*

DM – MUGA - *Included within the Youth initiative plans. A Stage 2 application form sent to the SSG Youth Project for further consideration*

EB – MUGA to increase footfall to the village including the community shop - *Included within the Youth initiative plans. A stage 2 application form sent to the SSG Youth Project for further consideration*

AB – Community Woodland - *A stage 2 application form will be sent via the SEG as it meets CIL regs*

KW – shared use of the tennis courts – *Discussions to be instigated to review options with PC representatives HV and AM with the SSGTC*

DS – Outdoor gym equipment – *Meets CIL regs and can be included as part of health and wellbeing for further consideration possibly in collusion with the Youth Initiative project*

DE – Barrier or associated works to the footpath/road to Polkesfield with a possible tarmac path to the housing from Dark Lane – *Clerk to report this suggestion to SCC highways. IU to include on the road safety survey.*

Since the meeting, the PC has received a suggestion of purchasing marquees for the use of community groups for community events. This will be added to collated suggestions for consideration.

If you have any suggestions, please let the PC know via the Stoke St Gregory Parish Council Facebook page, Instagram or by emailing the Clerk – ssgparishclerk@hotmail.co.uk

Next steps – acquiring the appropriate information required and accurate costings.

JP informs the next stage will be to establish the following information for the EOI's and suggestions agreed to go to the next stage of consideration;

Was this project one of the top priorities in the PIIP?

Was this project one of the top priorities on the completed Parish questionnaire?

How many people in the Community will this project benefit and for how long?

Does the project require a one-off expenditure, or will it require continued financial contributions to enable it to meet its goals?

How many people have requested that the money is spent on this project?

Have accurate costings been done?

What costings have been done?

Time frame set to achieve costings

Named person responsible for gathering information and supplying it to the Clerk.

How will this project be monitored in terms of outcomes?

JP suggests as the meeting is over running these questions can be raised with the relevant people and community groups.

JP informs the draft PIIP has made progress, a list of EOI's and suggestions has been agreed to go to the next stage. Next steps will be how the proposals feature within the top priorities of the community through the questionnaire results and community feedback and engagement. Once the PC has obtained further information; this can be cross examined and discussed for the purpose of how and when plus what provisions should be put in place for the allocation of CIL funding.

IU recommends a next step for considering the funding of the EOI's and suggestions/proposals - including some of the questions raised by JP - should be included in a correspondence to all successful EOIs and suggestions with a next stage application form to obtain all the information and intelligence.

Clerk to devise a Stage 2 application form by tomorrow (09/08/22) and circulate for authorisation to send to successful EOIs and suggestions. KdS to send the agreed form to the EOI and suggestion applicants to obtain further information requesting they are returned to the PC by the September PC meeting for consideration.

JP to correspond with those suggestions that have not been successful at this stage.

JH requests the PC consider holding a portion of the CIL money back until closer to the deadline of 25/10/2026 to spend the last portion (£32,195.35) of the CIL money received for any infrastructure investment required as a result of the development that has not yet arisen. JP responds this has been discussed and agreed at previous meetings, but with no actual sum identified.

HV informs this amount of money (£65,298.12) is not a huge amount in the grander scheme of things and questions if the PC should use it on one big venture and attempt to access further grants and funding towards it or do the PC use it on several projects. HV states it is about getting the right balance. HV states the PC does have limited precepted funds.

JP adds some of the smaller items could be considered within the remit of the PC. The Clerk expresses this would be possible but may mean an increase in the village precept to realise the projects.

DJ adds the MUGA could be considered separately to achieve the project over a period of time. JH responds the CIL monies are a good base to have for realising the project - if it were to be considered for funding approval - for the purpose of applying for grants and additional funding which is often applied as match funding for these types of projects.

JP expresses concerns with the timescales of allocating the money citing 2025/26 is not that far away.

IU would like to note the updated analysis of the CIL survey questionnaire has not been included within the content of the meeting and requests clarification on how this will feature feed into this process. JP responds the initial starting process has been to define if the EOIs and suggestions comply with CIL regulations. Once a project has gone through this first stage, it will be included within the PIIP to identify if it is a priority and how the priority featured within the questionnaire information and cross referenced prior to any final decisions being made.

Please see the analysis of the public consultation on use of Community Infrastructure Levy funds attached with the draft PIIP and draft minutes of the meeting.

3. Community Plan Steering Group

The Clerk informs the expression of interest to SALC to participate in the community review project (Min 82 July 2022) was submitted on 25th July 2022. The PC should expect to hear this week if it has been successful in its application.

To date 11 members of the public have expressed an interest in joining the steering group alongside Parish Councillors Janice Pearce, Ian Upshall, Danny James and the Clerk, Kelly de Silva.

The PC was notified on 9th August 2022 the application to the project had been successful. The PC will be contacting those who have expressed an interest in joining the steering group and next steps in the coming weeks)

4. Youth Project

The Clerk reports the TEN (Temporary Events Notice) has been applied for the village rounders event

being organised by AM. There were no objections from Somerset and Avon Police or the Environmental Health Officer, so this is now in place with the supporting information of the Notice sent to JP and AM.

5. Other Items for discussion

Regular Parish Council business report from the Clerk

The Clerk reports that under delegated powers (Min 239 19-03-20 to be reviewed in 2023) in consultation with the Chair, vice-chair and Parish Councillors the following planning applications have been responded to;

36/22/0013/CQ Lower Huntham Farm. Stoke St Gregory – Prior approval for proposed change of use from agricultural building to 1 No. dwelling house (Class C3) and associated building operations
“Stoke St Gregory Parish Council agreed to support this planning application”

36/22/0014/CQ Lower Huntham Farm. Stoke St Gregory – Prior approval for proposed change of use from agricultural building to 1 No. dwelling house (Class C3) and associated building operations
“Stoke St Gregory Parish Council agreed to support this planning application”

36/22/0010 Dark Lane Farm. Dark Lane, Stoke St Gregory – Erection of a two-storey extension to the rear of the dwelling

“Stoke St Gregory Parish Council agreed to support this planning application along with the recommendations of the bat survey”

36/22/0012 Ash Grove. Stoke road, Meare Green, Stoke St Gregory – Demolition of garage and erection of a single storey extension to the side of the dwelling

“Stoke St Gregory Parish Council agreed to support this planning application”

Payments for authorisation

Standing Order

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---------|
| K de Silva – Clerks Salary for July | £385.95 |
|-------------------------------------|---------|

| | |
|---|--------|
| K de Silva - Clerks Expenses 2x Printer Ink £39.90, Application for the TEN for the rounders event £21.00 | £60.90 |
|---|--------|

| | |
|---|---------|
| Nick Sloan – Web Admin £120.00 Annual sub for PDF embedder plug in £13.92 | £133.92 |
|---|---------|

| | |
|----------------------------|--------|
| J Williams – Grass Cutting | £90.00 |
|----------------------------|--------|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| G Wagen and James – Burial Ground | £126.00 |
|-----------------------------------|---------|

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--------|
| Rockwell – Printing Summer newsletter | £69.00 |
|---------------------------------------|--------|

HV proposes all payments are made, seconded by JM; all in favour.

The Clerk explains a payment has been made to HMRC PAYE for £27.60 as the Clerk has two employers and HMRC had not split the tax code correctly between the two employments. This has now been amended by HMRC and the amount should be rebated to the PC by HMRC as the Clerk earns less than the tax threshold. This payment was made out of Council with the authorisation of the Chair, Vice chair and signatories due to the deadline such payments are required to be made to HMRC PAYE.

There being no further business the meeting was closed at 9.45pm

Please see the supporting documents of the draft PIIP and the analysis of the community survey/questionnaire. The road safety and signage audit is an extensive piece of work that will be available on completion.

The next Parish Council Meeting will be held in the main hall at The Williams Hall, Dark Lane, Stoke St Gregory on Monday 12th September 2022 at 7.30pm. Please email any items for the agenda to the Clerk (ssgparishclerk@hotmail.co.uk) or the Chair (pearcejanice@hotmail.co.uk) by Friday 2nd September 2022

10 Signed by the Chair.....Date.....