

Mrs. L.A. Ruff, Clerk of the Council, Street Parish Rooms, 6 Leigh Road, Street, Somerset BA16 0HA Tel. (01458) 440588

Email [street.parish@street-pc.gov.uk](mailto:street.parish@street-pc.gov.uk) Website [www.street-pc.gov.uk](http://www.street-pc.gov.uk)

11th February 2021

**PLEASE NOTE DATE AND TIME**

Dear Sir/Madam,

You are summoned to attend the meeting of the Street Parish Council which will

be held **virtually using Zoom** with remote attendance **on TUESDAY, 16TH FEBRUARY 2021** for the purpose of transacting the business specified in the following agenda. Public Question Time will commence at approximately **6.55 p.m**. The Chair will allow each person who has registered with the Clerk to speak for up to 3 minutes on any subject/s and will firstly explain the procedures for the meeting. Persons speaking will have been informed that the meeting will be recorded. The Council meeting will commence at approximately **7 p.m**. or as soon as Public Question Time is closed by the Chair. Notes of Public Question Time on 19th and 28th January 2021 attached - **Pages 3 - 5**. The meeting will be streamed live on YouTube on the Council’s YouTube channel at <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCiwCtXUydITXA9OpDqQfvIA/videos>

In accordance with standing orders 7 c and d, a member with a disclosable pecuniary interest must leave the meeting and be placed in the waiting room during the relevant item of business, unless permitted to remain following the grant of a dispensation. Councillors

with an interest in relation to any item of business being transacted at a meeting under Appendix B (Other Interests) or where a matter relates to a financial interest of a friend, relative or close associate, may (i) make representations, (ii) answer questions and (iii) give evidence relating to the business being transacted but must thereafter leave the meeting and be placed in the waiting room, unless permitted to remain following the grant of a dispensation. At a convenient time the Chair will also give this opportunity to any members of the public who have registered to speak with the Clerk prior to the meeting.

Yours faithfully,

****

L.A. Ruff

Clerk of the Council

**AGENDA**

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE - acceptance of any reasons offered.

2. MINUTES

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the extraordinary meeting of the Council held on 28th January 2021 (attached) **Pages 6 – 9**

3. MATTERS ARISING

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND DISPENSATIONS

To receive declarations of interest from Councillors on agenda items and to

receive written requests for dispensations for disclosable pecuniary interests

(if any). Clerk to grant any requests for dispensation as appropriate.
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5. MINDFUL EMOTION COACHING/ADVERSE CHILDHOOD EXPERIENCES

To receive a presentation from Dr. S. Temple on the impact of adverse childhood

experiences and mindful emotion coaching.

6. COMMUNITY POLICEMAN – a confidential meeting to be arranged to discuss

whether each town should buy deployable CCTV for the Police to use in the future

rather than contributing each year to the Mendip scheme

7. PLANNING COMMITTEE

To receive minutes of the meeting held on 19th January (attached) **Pages 10 – 11**

Mendip Local Plan Part II: Sites and Policies: Consultation on Additional Main

Modifications **Pages 11A – 11B**

8. POLICY AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

To receive minutes of the meeting held on 2nd February (attached) **Pages 12 - 14**

9. CASUAL VACANCY ON SOUTH WARD (report attached) **Pages 15 - 16**

10. HIGHWAYS WORKING GROUP

To receive notes of the meeting on 21st January (attached) **Pages** **17 - 20**

11. STREET COMMUNITY LIBRARY PARTNERSHIP

To receive notes of the meeting on 28th January (attached) **Pages 21 – 23**

12. REPORT FROM CHAIR

13. PARISH PATH LIAISON OFFICER – County Cllr. Leyshon to give a verbal

report on behalf of PPLO Jake Dalton.

14. BUSINESS ACTION GROUP – to receive a verbal update from the Group

15. MENDIP STRATEGIC TOURISM FORUM – notes of 28th January **Pages 24 - 26**

16. CHAIR UPDATES FROM OTHER COMMITTEES/WORKING GROUPS

17. CORRESPONDENCE/MINOR MATTERS (attached) **Pages 27 - 30**

18. REPORT FROM REPRESENTATIVES ON OUTSIDE BODIES

AND COUNTY AND DISTRICT COUNCILLORS

Questions to be noted for written replies and matters for consideration

referred to the appropriate working group. All reports received have been

emailed to members.

19. ACCOUNTS FOR PAYMENT (schedule of payments attached for approval and

initialing by Chair to be arranged) and confidential detailed income and expenditure

by account report at 31st January 2021 including budget variance –

emailed to members only with bank reconciliations and earmarked reserves

schedule. **Page 31 + Confidential attachment for members only**

20. MATTERS FOR REPORT

Consideration of items not on agenda for information only

(a) Report from Clerk

(b) Matters raised by members - TO BE NOTIFIED TO THE CLERK IN

ADVANCE OF MEETING.
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21. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

In accordance with the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960 amended

by the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014, it is probable that

a resolution will be passed at the meeting to exclude the press and public for item no.

22 below as it involves confidential staffing pension information.

22. PENSION TRANSFER

Confidential report circulated to councillors only.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

To: Chair and Members of Street Parish Council
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NOTES OF PUBLIC QUESTION TIME HELD BEFORE

COUNCIL MEETING ON 19TH JANUARY 2021

Councillor Napper spoke on behalf of a resident who did not have access to remote meetings. She felt that there was only space for burials in the existing churchyard for another 4 to 5 years not 10 years as had been stated. She did not think that the land should be sold for social housing as it had been designated before for the cemetery. It was agreed that this should be raised at the meeting on 28th January. The Chair asked Councillor Napper to inform the resident that members missed seeing her since meetings had gone online. The resident wished to have a copy of the minutes of the meeting on 28th January and these would be sent to her.

A resident raised the big divide in broadband infrastructure in Street. This had a big impact on those working at home including businesses and school children. Councillor Knibbs agreed that this was a problem. The Chair explained that the issue would be considered at the meeting as an agenda item.
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NOTES OF PUBLIC QUESTION TIME HELD BEFORE

EXTRAORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING ON 28TH JANUARY 2021

The Chair, Councillor Prior read out a statement explaining that the Council had sent out an information leaflet to every household on the emerging proposals for the 2 sites and responses had been collated and sent to members.

A representative of Street Chamber of Trade and Commerce had received a lot of responses from traders, professionals, restaurants and others. Over two thirds of the car park would be lost i.e. over 200 spaces. It was felt that the leaflet distributed was evenly balanced but it was disappointing that this loss of spaces had not been made clear to people. In 2020 spending in the independent sector had risen by 28.6% and there was a tremendous opportunity to grow and develop as the pandemic eased. He felt that social housing should be provided on every new development commensurate to the number of houses built and not built on the car park.

A resident who lived next to Cranhill Road car park referred to a previous proposal to build on the area and a packed public meeting held in 2018. People had been against this due to the loss of spaces. The High Street needed all the support it could get. Bore holes had been made in the car park in 2018 and a geotechnical report recently received following a Freedom of Information request had shown that there were carcinogenic materials and gases under the ground.

Another resident had a shop in the High Street and referred to the meeting in 2018. He was not against affordable housing but did not think it should be built on the car park or on the cemetery extension. He felt that revenue coming from car parks in Street was spent by the District Council in other places.

Another resident stated that everyone they had spoken to was against building on the cemetery land. It was felt that the cemetery would be full quite soon and that this should remain a quiet place to honour the dead and experience the natural world. Two extra exits onto Cemetery Lane would have an impact on the people who walked and cycled there. She felt that the alternative proposal should be considered. Councillor P. Goater chaired the session while Councillor Prior sorted out his internet connection.

A further resident had a relative buried at the cemetery and pointed out that there had been no consultation with plot holders and families. This should be a quiet area and not have a building site next to it.

Another resident felt that the District Council had not followed due process and had used the pandemic to push the scheme forward. The District Council had not followed it’s own policies to seek best consideration when disposing of any asset. Replacement parking might be at higher prices and she referred to noise, disturbance, overlooking, lack of privacy. The only entrance was off a road leading to Bluestone Court, a retirement scheme and this was the access to it for those walking and others with no footpath.
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Another resident had commented that the car park should not be built on. The schools were already full and there was a horrendous volume of traffic. Cranhill Road and Orchard Road would become short cuts and it would be difficult to find a parking space, particularly in the Summer.

A resident referred to the allocation of the cemetery extension for housing 2.5 years ago. In 2006 the District Council had refused permission for a scout hut at the site due to road access, loss of natural habitat and historic hedgerows. Cemetery Lane would become a short cut with an additional 40 to 50 cars at the new site. The entrance and exit to the bypass were already a problem. The need to widen the lane, provide a pavement and lights would cost a lot and hedgerows would be lost.

Councillor Prior encouraged residents to email further comments to the Council as they needed to be very involved in the process. These would be followed up and responses from the District Council posted on the website. He urged people to stay involved and active.
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STREET PARISH COUNCIL

Extraordinary meeting of the Council held virtually using Zoom with

remote attendance on 28th January, 2021 at 7.37 p.m.

PRESENT: Councillor A. Prior (Vice-Chair of Council)

(In the Chair)

Councillors: P. Birch, S. Carswell, M. Daniells,

D. Drew, D. Goater, P. Goater, D. Knibbs, L. Mogg, T.W.E. Napper and N. Smith

IN ATTENDANCE: L. Ruff – Clerk/RFO

M. Sandiford – Assistant Clerk Projects Officer

B. Spiller – Chapman Lily Planning Ltd. for Aster

Group

County Councillor L. Leyshon

APOLOGIES: Councillors R. Boyce – working, A. Leafe (Chair)

H. Shearer and L. Wolfers – another meeting or

engagement - reasons accepted

151. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 19th January, 2021 which had been circulated were approved as a correct record and arrangements would be made for them to be signed by the Chair in accordance with current guidance.

The Clerk agreed to contact Councillor Smith regarding resolution B of

Minute No. 140. The Chair read out a statement reminding members

that the meeting concerned initial discussions with Chapman Lily on the

emerging proposals for the 2 sites which would not in any way impact on any subsequent planning applications, for which the Parish Council would be a statutory consultee.

152. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND DISPENSATIONS

In accordance with the Code of Conduct Councillors Carswell and Napper declared an other interest under Appendix B in any matters relating to the District Council and stated that they would keep an open mind when considering issues at either District or Parish level. Councillor Napper also declared an other interest under Appendix B in any matters relating to the County Council and that he would keep an open mind when considering matters at County or Parish level.

Councillor P. Goater stated that he was pre-determined as he had campaigned against the development of Cranhill Road car park.

Councillor Birch declared a personal interest in the site at Cemetery Lane as her son lived near to it. Councillor Mogg declared a personal interest in the site at Cemetery Lane as he lived near to it. After making representations Councillors Birch, P. Goater and Mogg left the meeting at 8.05 p.m.
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153. AFFORDABLE AND SOCIAL HOUSING – PUBLIC

CONSULTATION – DISTRICT COUNCIL OWNED SITES

AT CEMETERY LANE AND CRANHILL ROAD CAR PARK, STREET

The ACPO gave a summary of the responses received to the

information leaflet delivered to 6,843 households including some in

Walton. 54 written responses had been received and 8 people had

spoken during Public Question Time. Some people had commented on

both of the sites and some on one or the other. The responses had

been circulated to members including an alternative proposal received

2 days earlier from a landowner offering to gift just under 4 acres to the

District Council provided that an equal area could be sold for residential

development. It was also suggested that the entire cemetery and car

park be transferred to the Parish Council.

Questions received had been summarised and sent to Mendip District

Council and responses would be available soon on the Council’s

website. Councillor Birch stated that she was in support of social

housing but did not consider the 2 sites were the right locations for this.

Before 2017 the land at Cemetery Lane had been earmarked as an

extension to the cemetery and people had bought houses in Portland

Road assuming that this would not change. She was concerned about

the impact on wildlife and habitat, that the Lane was single width and

there was a lack of parking in Houndwood Drove and Portland Road

with a difficult exit on to the busy bypass. She felt that the car park was

important for local people to use and to support the High Street.

Councillor Goater felt that Cranhill Road car park should be protected

to support the High Street and businesses. He felt that the data used

to justify the development was spurious and that a parking strategy was

needed and that visitors needed to be able to find the car park for the

cheapest parking. He also felt that there needed to be a burials

strategy for 50 years. He was in support of the alternative proposal

and the transfer of the cemetery and car park to the Parish Council.

Councillor Mogg agreed with comments already made and stressed the

need for parking as Street got back to normal and expanded. He felt

that use of the cemetery extension was not acceptable and that the

alternative site would be better.
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With regard to possible development of the former Tesco building and

car park Councillor Leyshon explained that the District Council was not

planning to invest in any retail or High Street sites. B. Spiller could not

comment on the wider issues but explained that community

engagement was a statutory process for Aster. Even without the

pandemic microsites would have been used as they made the

information more available to people. The substance of the comments

received by the Council were the same as Chapman Lily had received.

There was a need for affordable housing with around 204 households

for Street currently on the housing register. The site at Cemetery

Lane had been extensively consulted on through the Local Plan

process and this was at a very advanced stage. It was clear that this

would be a housing site. Chapman Lily would consider all responses

and would make some changes at Cemetery Lane. Consideration of

the car park was less advanced. Councillor Daniells encouraged the

public to engage with the District Council regarding the sale of the land.

Councillor Leyshon explained that the District Council had received

around £846,000 from the Government as land release funds for sites

including the one at Cemetery Lane but not Cranhill car park. Most of

this had been spent. There was a housing crisis but it seemed that no

one wanted social housing near them. The District Council was trying

to find solutions and could state this even if it failed.

Councillor Smith was concerned that plot holders at the cemetery had

not been consulted and about the danger of building on the car park if

there were carcinogenic materials underground. She felt the

alternative site would be better. B. Spiller stated that the site at

Cemetery Lane had been allocated for housing through the Local Plan

and that a suitable remediation scheme or mitigation was currently

being considered. The meeting was adjourned from 8.30 p.m. to

8.35 p.m. to allow a resident to speak. Councillor D. Goater felt that

the offer of the alternative site should be pursued and that if the car

park and cemetery were transferred to the Parish Council this would be

good as they would generate a lot of income.

Councillor Leyshon explained that the alternative site was outside of

the development line for Street, land release and other funds had

mostly been committed, the site at Cemetery Lane had been allocated

in the Local Plan for a few years and there was a need to have a 5 year

housing supply. The District Council would need time to consider how

to progress and there would be a commitment to the process until a

decision was made not to pursue it. The Parish Council had the

opportunity to comment on Cemetery Lane through the Local Plan

consultation and could have sent a leaflet to every household as had

been done now.
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Councillor Carswell was in favour of social housing on both sites with

less than 1% of those consulted having responded and the need for

housing being greater than the needs in respect of the 2 sites.

Cemetery Lane would go ahead as it was allocated in the Local Plan.

Possibly less spaces might be built on at the car park. The alternative

site was good but the timing of it was interesting. Councillor Drew felt

that the responses to questions raised from the District Council were

good with it acknowledging that it should have consulted with the

Parish Council earlier. She felt that there were a lot more issues with

the High Street than parking.

RESOLVED

A. that the District Council be asked to consider the alternative land

as it is the view of the Parish Council and the people of Street that the

release of land to the north would be the optimum solution

B. that delegated authority be given to the ACPO in consultation with

the Vice-Chair of the Council to summarise all the comments made on

the emerging proposals for the 2 sites and then to circulate this to

members before submission to Chapman Lily early the following week

C. that the Council would respond to the landowner offering the

alternative site.

154. MATTERS FOR REPORT

It was noted that the District Council did not own any of the allotment

sites in Street and that the duty to provide allotments rested with local

councils. The allotments in Strode Road had been transferred to the

Council from the District Council subject to the land being used for this

purpose. It was agreed that Councillors Napper and Prior would follow

up on a rogue trader issue with a resident of The Mead.

The meeting ended at 9.25 p.m.
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STREET PARISH COUNCIL

Meeting of the Planning Committee held virtually using Zoom with remote attendance on 19th January 2021 at 6:15 pm

PRESENT: Councillor L Wolfers - Chair

Councillor L Mogg – Vice Chair

Councillor P Birch, D Knibbs

APOLOGIES : Councillors A Leaf, N Smith

IN ATTENDANCE: J Marshfield – Assistant Clerk.

18. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 17th November 2020 which had been

circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

19. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND DISPENSATIONS

Cllrs Wolfers and Mogg declared an interest in Planning Application 2020/1975/HSE as they know the applicant, as a quorum would not be present if they left the meeting it was agreed to recommend that the decision for this application be left to the Planning Officer following consultation responses.

20. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Assistant Clerk submitted a report which had been circulated.

RESOLVED

2020/2481/ADV Erection of 1no. Facia Sign, 2no. Notice Boards, 1no. Double

Sided Free Standing Sign at 6 Leigh Road Street - Recommend that the decision for this application be left to the Planning Officer following consultation responses.

2020/1975/HSE Erection of two storey side extension at 13 Brooks Road Street - Recommend that the decision for this application be left to the Planning Officer following consultation responses.

2020/2513/HSE Erection of a two-storey side extension and new porch at 21 Queens Road Street – APPROVAL - concerns of the proposed office/playroom window large side opening overlooking neighbouring property.
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2020/2533/VRC Application to vary condition 1 (description) of planning approval 2018/0339/VRC (Application to vary condition 9 (retail floor space) of planning approval 2016/1108/VRC (which amended conditions 9 - individual floor space and 10 - retail floor space of the original outline planning permission 2014/2561/OTS) (amended description 15/4/18) to read "The first of the remaining unimplemented phases (5, 6A and 6B as shown on the phasing plan approved under 2015/2186/APP) of the development hereby approved shall be begun either before the expiration of six years from the date of planning permission 2014/2561/OTS (dated 28th April 2015), or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the latest." at Street Business Park Gravenchon Way Street – APPROVAL - concerns regarding the date of the true traffic and ecological report being carried out not being a true reflection due to being in lockdown situation.

2020/2579/HSE Erection of a two-storey extension to the North West Elevation, two storey extension to the South East Elevation and single storey rear extension with a balcony area to the flat roof at 5 Housman Road Street – APPROVAL

2021/0003/HSE Proposed first floor extension over existing bungalow at 35 Silver Road Street - APPROVAL

NOTE – 2 new units approved – 1 since July 2020.

The meeting ended at 6:30 pm.

- 11 -

**Mendip Local Plan Part II: Sites and Policies:**

**Consultation on Additional Main Modifications**

8th February 2021

Dear Sir/Madam,

Following the examination hearings completed in December 2020, the Inspector has advised the Council on his next steps before issuing his final report.

The Inspector has requested the Council consult on specific changes to address the following matters:

1. Reference to phosphate mitigation on some development allocations in the Plan as agreed with Natural England. This largely affects the western half of Mendip (west of Wells, Shepton Mallet, Street and Glastonbury)
2. The deletion of draft allocation RD1 (Rode) put forward as a Main Modification.

This is explained in the Inspectors Progress Note (Examination Document) ED48 which is available at website at [*https://www.mendip.gov.uk/localplanexamination*](https://eur03.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.mendip.gov.uk%2Flocalplanexamination&data=04%7C01%7Cstreet.parish%40street-pc.gov.uk%7Cb6b4e4435789482f11a108d8cc4403b9%7C1b2a435d8c0c4c29a248215370c6a4ab%7C0%7C0%7C637483939788473648%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=MU3BjXpyGP9f9FRBNWxv5anbCi0ivpYcZAUUdVyrDd4%3D&reserved=0)

The Council have published a Schedule of Additional Main Modifications and is inviting representations on these changes. This schedule of modifications and response forms can found at[**https://www.mendip.gov.uk/amm**](https://eur03.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.mendip.gov.uk%2Famm&data=04%7C01%7Cstreet.parish%40street-pc.gov.uk%7Cb6b4e4435789482f11a108d8cc4403b9%7C1b2a435d8c0c4c29a248215370c6a4ab%7C0%7C0%7C637483939788483605%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=OCemkkxV0vI3wZ2FrUswd37Phu%2B192vf6ycXy15XBbc%3D&reserved=0)together with supporting information and an updated ‘track change’ version of Local Plan Part II.

The consultation is limited to responses on the changes in the schedule. The Inspector will not be considering other matters or representations on sites already considered in the examination process. Responses made will be provided to the Inspector for his consideration. The progress note indicates the Inspector is aiming to provide a final report on the examination by the end of April 2021.

**The consultation will be open from Tuesday 9th February and close at 5pm Monday 22nd March 2021.**

**Availability of Consultation Documents**

The Mendip Council offices and access points are currently closed to the public. Please contact the Planning Policy Team by email at [planningpolicy@mendip.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@mendip.gov.uk) or by telephone on (0300) 303 8588 if you have difficulty accessing the documents online or to obtain a hard copy.

**Responding to the Consultation**

To assist the Inspector, responses should be made on the attached response form. Please read the information note (attached) which provides further advice. All responses must be in writing and include your name and full postal address.

All responses should be returned **by 5pm** **Monday 22nd March.**
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **By post to:** | Planning Policy, Mendip District Council, Cannards Grave Road, Shepton Mallet, Somerset, BA4 5BT or by hand via the letterbox at the entrance to the Council Offices. |
| **By email to:** | [planningpolicy@mendip.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@mendip.gov.uk) |
|  |  |

Yours faithfully

*Andre Sestini*

Andre Sestini

Principal Planning Policy Officer
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STREET PARISH COUNCIL

Meeting of the Policy and Finance Committee held virtually using Zoom

with remote attendance on 2nd February, 2021 at 6.08 p.m.

PRESENT: Councillor A. Prior (Chair)

Councillors: S. Carswell, M. Daniells, P. Goater,

L. Mogg and N. Smith

IN ATTENDANCE: Mrs. L.A. Ruff – Clerk

APOLOGIES: Councillors D. Knibbs and H. Shearer – another

meeting/engagement – reasons accepted

15. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 3rd November,

2020 which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record

and arrangements made for them to be signed by the Chair in

accordance with current guidance.

16. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND DISPENSATIONS

In accordance with the Code of Conduct Councillor Goater declared an

other interest under Appendix B as he was a member of Mendip

District Council and that he would keep an open mind when

considering matters at either parish or district level.

17. BI-ANNUAL REVIEW OF RISK ASSESSMENT

The Clerk submitted a report which had been circulated.

RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND

that the report be approved and a new debit card be requested in the

name of Councillor Daniells to replace that formerly held by C. Axten.

18. ANNUAL INVESTMENT STRATEGY

The Clerk submitted a report which had been circulated. It was noted

that there could be negative equity in future and so although interest

rates were very low this was better than that.

RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND
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that the Annual Investment Strategy for 2021/22 be approved.

19. RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS OCTOBER – DECEMBER 2020

The report of the Clerk had been circulated. The detailed income and

expenditure report by code at 31st December 2020 appears as Annex A

to these minutes in the Minute Book. Attention was drawn to the

following significant variations between the budget set and income or

expenditure -

EXPENDITURE

1358 Civic Event and Badges

£10,000 allocation not spent on Chair’s Investiture, Merriman Park Fun Day and other events due to the pandemic and added to Earmarked Reserves for a post Covid celebration.

1800 Issues for Street

Just under £13,000 remaining to support the community and vulnerable people.

INCOME

1179 Grants Received

Original grant from Somerset County Council towards refurbishment of Parish Rooms was £50,000. It was agreed that the cost of the new library furniture, moving the comms cabinet and ICT equipment would be taken from this which will leave a final grant of around £18,000.

1185 Supply of Library Services

£11,250 paid at 31st December in accordance with the CLP agreement with a further £3,750 due for January to March 2021.

1577 PWLB Loan

A second loan was taken out on 24th July 2020 towards the costs of altering the Parish Rooms of £100,000 minus the admin fee of £35.

1677 Merriman Park Grants Received

Grant of £50,000 received from a local trust as 50% match funding for new 0 to 11 years play area within the Park.

RESOLVED

that the reports be agreed.
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20. PERIODIC REPORTS AND INSPECTIONS

The Clerk submitted a report which had been circulated.

RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND

that the report be agreed.

21. MATTERS FOR REPORT

Staff and members were in regular contact with local organisations

including the Salvation Army, Theatre and Community Centre and it

was felt that if they needed a grant they would contact the Council. It

was also noted that if the Council decided to apply for a grant this was

usually a lot of work and it would be best to employ a professional

grant writer.

It was not necessary to hold the Chair’s Investiture and it was unlikely

that this could take place in 2021 in any event due to the pandemic.

It was intended that the event would become more of an awards

ceremony with local organisations nominating their heros of Street.

The event might be held in the Crispin Hall. There was a real need to

recognise those who had helped through the pandemic.

£10,000 had been earmarked for a post Covid celebration and it was

felt that this should be well planned and involve everyone. It could

incorporate the re-opening of the library, Greenbank Pool, Merriman

Park with an indoor option in the event of bad weather. Local

businesses could sell beer, burgers etc.

It was agreed that grant applications should be considered by the

Committee for scrutiny before going to the Council unless the grant

was needed for an emergency. The Clerk pointed out that it was

sometimes more efficient to hold an extraordinary meeting of the

Council, as with the grant to Greenbank Pool, so that information

could be considered and a decision reached. There was often a lot

of business being dealt with and not enough time to hold extra

meetings.

The meeting ended at 6.52 p.m.

Councillor Carswell arrived at 6.17 p.m.
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AGENDA ITEM NO: 9

To: Council

From: Clerk

Subject: Casual Vacancy on South Ward

The Chair to call for nominations to fill the vacant seat in the South Ward by co-option to the Council (procedure attached). As the period of the vacancy has more than 6 months to run the Council must co opt to fill it. C. Axten resigned from the Council in November 2020 and a poll was not claimed in time. Public notices have been displayed inviting suitably qualified people to apply to the Council for co option on the website and Facebook. The candidates who have stated that they wish to be considered for the vacant seat are as follows and their forms are attached for members -

None as at 11th February - if no one comes forward by the date of the meeting the

Item will be placed on the agenda for the March meeting.

All persons have certified in writing that they meet the criteria for eligibility set out in section 79 of the Local Government Act 1972 to be a member of the Council and are not disqualified pursuant to section 80 of the Act. To qualify as a candidate persons must live, have a business or work in Street or within 4.8 km for at least 1 year or be on the electoral role and be over 18 years of age.

Any candidate who is to be considered for co option until the end of the current term in May 2023 must be proposed and seconded at the meeting. Voting will be carried out in public by show of hands and candidates will be invited to go in to the waiting room for this.

The Council can then agree that the successful candidate is appointed to the committees and working groups which they indicated on the form that they wished to serve on.

L.A. Ruff

Clerk

16.02.21
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A successful candidate must have received an absolute majority vote of those present and voting i.e. over half of the votes cast. If this is not the case voting continues until someone does have an absolute majority of votes cast. This is done by striking off the candidate with the least number of votes and the remainder must then be put to the vote again.

This will mostly be a satisfactory procedure but if several candidates have obtained the same number of least votes and the aggregate of the others is less than a normal quorum eg. 3:2:2:2:2, it may be thought wise not to strike off all those with the least votes together but, if negotiations for withdrawals fail, to strike them off one by one, in an order determined by vote.

If there is an equal number of votes the Chair can use their casting vote to decide on a candidate. The new co-opted member can if present, sign the declaration of acceptance of office and then take part in the meeting but as it will be a remote meeting and, if not present can sign before or at the next ordinary meeting of the Council.
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**NOTES OF HIGHWAYS WORKING GROUP**

**Date:** 21 January 2021

**Attendees:** **Street Parish Council**

Cllr. Peter Goater (PG) Cllr. Terry Napper (TN)

Cllr. Heather Shearer (HS) Mark Sandiford (MS) ACPO

Cllr. Luke Mogg (LM) Cllr. Nicola Smith (NS)

**Somerset County Council**

Liz Leyshon (LL)

**Apologies:**

**Absences:** None

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Notes** | **Actions** |
| **1. ELECTION OF CHAIR – to May 2021**  It was agreed that Cllr. P Goater be elected as Chair until May 2021 |  |
| **2. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR – to May 2021**  It was agreed Cllr. L Mogg be elected as Vice Chair until May 2021 |  |
| **3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**  None |  |
| **4. NOTES OF MEETING HELD ON 3 November 2020**  The notes were agreed as accurate. |  |
| **5. SECTION 106 FUNDING – CYCLE RACKS**  MS confirmed that all invoices had now been paid relating to the Greenbank cycle racks. The total cost of the project was £4,692 (excluding VAT) leaving around £3.5k of S106 funding for further projects.  Discussion followed around which further locations would be suitable for additional or new bike racks. It was originally agreed to recommend Merriman Park, but later agreed that funding would be better used to provide additional SID locations and replacement batteries, if the S106 agreement would allow. MS to review S106 agreement and confirm. | MS |
| **- 17 -**  **6. SECTION 106 FUNDING – IMPROVEMENTS TO PEDESTRIAN NETWORK**  MS confirmed that a funding application for £55k had been submitted to the Climate Emergency Community Fund 2020-2021 on 7th January, to install  a  combined cycle/footpath along the A39, linking Street Roundabout to the  turning off the A39 towards Clarks HQ/Clarks Village car park.  All applications will receive a response within 6 weeks of the application closure date (12th January) to confirm if their project has been selected for Panel review. Final decisions taken by the Panel will be notified by 11th March 2021.  An application for pre-app planning advice was made on 8th December. The application has been acknowledged, but to date, no further correspondence has been received from Mendip DC. |  |
| **7. PARKING RESTRICTIONS**  No further sites were identified; however, all agreed the parking was an issue in heavily populated areas, around schools during pick up and drop off times, and Greenbank during the summer.  Issues had also been raised regarding the new parking enforcement being operated at the Bayliss centre by Britannia, where public are unaware of the penalties and the fact that it is private land. |  |
| **8. SPEED INDICATOR DEVICES**  PG had reported that the batteries needed charging in the SID’s. MS reported that SLH had already confirmed that batteries are changed every 3 weeks as per the agreement and are due to be changed next week. If the batteries are no longer lasting 3 weeks, new batteries will be required or the frequency in which they are changed increase. SLH will continue to monitor the situation.  It was suggested that S106 funds could be better used to provide additional SID sites and replacement batteries, instead of providing additional cycle racks. All agreed – MS will check agreement to see of this would be permitted.  All agreed to identify possible new SID sites for discussion at the next meeting. Some suggestions to date are Grange Avenue, Slugg Hill, Somerton Road,  LL requested that MS contact SALC to ask where other councils purchase SID’s, and HS asked if SPC could look into a possible grant from the Road Safety Fund, so see if we can obtain a further SID.  - 18 -  NS asked if SPC hold any road safety events, as BRAKE have provided information regarding the road safety week from 16th to 22nd November. All agreed that it is something SPC could promote, and possibly tie in with a new SID as a road safety project. NS will investigate further and report back at the next meeting. | MS  All  MS  NS |
| **9. PARISH SPEED LIMIT**  Due to the ongoing situation with Covid-19, it was agreed to put any discussion on the introduction of a parish speed limit on hold for at least 6 months. |  |
| **10. SMALL IMPROVEMENTS SCHEME**  LL confirmed that the Brooks Road SIS scheme was still progressing. It has been much watered down from the original proposal but would still include the 20MPH speed limit outside of Brookside School when the lights are flashing, and unmanned crossings/dropped curbs. |  |
| **11. BUSKING SITES**  Three sites had been identified, outside of 98A High Street, Boots and in the library gardens.  A further site was discussed, in consideration that a business may move into the vacant premisses at 98A High Street, or Richard Clark will not permit busking in the library gardens. Near the Farm Road crossing was suggested, although discussions would be needed with Landsec.  It was intended that only buskers meeting certain standards would be allowed to perform, however, it was unclear how this could be administered or enforced. MS would speak to PC Mark Pople and Gerard Tucker, Clerk of Glastonbury Town Council, for advice. | MS |
| **12. MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS**  **No Cold Calling**  MS reported that a member of the public had been harassed by cold callers and had asked if the signs could be renewed at the entrances to Street confirming that we are a no cold calling village. Agreed MS to contact Neighbourhood Watch to discuss.  - 19 -  **Antisocial Signs**  LM asked if the antisocial signs (no alhohol, drugs etc) that were in the possession of SPC could be put up by the underpasses. MS to progress.  **Path at Slugg Hill**  A member of the public had requested that the path be levelled underneath the oak tree at Slugg Hill, as it was very dangerous when trying to navigate with a mobility scooter as the path dramatically sloped towards the road. LL agreed that this is a particularly dangerous road due to speeding traffic, and would raise it with County Highways, although was realistic in stating that it would be a very long time before it would be addressed. | MS  MS |
| **13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**  Agreed that the next meeting will be held at 10am 25th February 2021 |  |
| HS left the meeting 11:00. Meeting ended at 11:45 |  |

Notes produced by:

**Mark Sandiford**

**Assistant Clerk & Projects Officer**
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**NOTES OF STREET COMMUNITY LIBRARY PARTNERSHIP MEETING ON**

**28TH JANUARY 2021.**

PRESENT: Councillors M Daniells (MD), D Drew (DD), P Goater (PG),

A Prior (AP)

L Ruff (LR) – SPC Clerk

J Marshfield (JM) – SPC Assistant Clerk

S Crowley (SC), C Amery (CA) – SCC Library Service

C Axten (CAx), P Fry (PF) – Friends of Street Library (FOSL)

APOLOGIES County Councillor L Leyshon

**STREET CLP AGREEMENT**

SC suggested that due to the agreement length, it would be best to highlight sections of the agreement for the benefit of the new Councillors present at the meeting.

* Some contact details within the agreement will need updating – SCC will do this.
* It is Street Parish Council’s responsibility to manage the library, however, the Library will continue to be part of Somerset’s Library Service and this will be managed as part of the LibrariesWest Consortium.
* SPC and FOSL are free to develop the services of the Library.
* The library to be accessible to all and continue to operate in the same way as other libraries. Members of Street library are able to access all libraries across the consortium.
* SCC will help to provide technical support training, reference stock, IT equipment, network and help desk support.
* SCC will maintain and refresh stock.
* Lending stock, including donated stock to the library, will be made available across the LibrariesWest consortium area.
* SPC have the option to increase or change the library opening hours. This could either be carried out by volunteers or library staff. This would need to be discussed with FOSL and SCC if increasing library staff hours.
* Any income to the library via fines etc is given to SPC although charges are being waived at this present time.
* SCC retain ownership of all furniture within the library. Any changes, relocation or repair is SPC responsibility.
* Hardware such as IT equipment SCC maintain responsibility.
* SCC to update inventory with maintenance responsibility.
* Each partner to hold their own Public and Employer’s Liability insurance.
* Volunteers are the responsibility of FOSL, library staff to supervise.
* Branding can be changed but must retain library in the title.
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**The following questions were raised: -**

LR asked as SPC are paying half of the staffing costs are other CLP’s across the county doing this?

CA – All CLP’s are except 4 due to being volunteer run.

PF asked if items are purchased by FOSL do they belong to the library or FOSL?

SC – Any items bought by FOSL belong and are managed by FOSL

CAx asked if payments are made via the kiosk, does the money come to The Street library?

CA – credit card payments have been disabled, kiosks at the moment are cash only.

CAx suggested that in the future credit card payments could be more accessible for the public and reduces the need for staff having to bank cash.

AP asked if SPC could change the internet provider?

SC – No, as the computer system is on the SCC network.

CAx asked if FOSL provide software for the Digital Den is there an inventory for this?

SC/CA – These items to go on main inventory, FOSL need to keep library staff updated of purchases to be added to the inventory.

MD asked are volunteers DBS checked?

AP asked if volunteers already have been DBS checked is it transferable? Is there a cost?

SC – DBS checks are for individual activities and are not a blanket cover. Unsure of cost – may need a separate meeting to discuss.

**QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE REPORT**

CA informed the group that most of the stats were from the regular system and given the current circumstances are unable give a true comparison.

LR asked as the library staff are working from home, how are their daily working hours being spent?

CA – staff are doing a lot of promotional material on social media via the Facebook and Instagram pages, updating the local press, digital training and customer support. Weekly meetings are being held via Zoom and monthly records are being sent to SPC.

LR asked as the library is closed is there a possibility of having the mobile library again? Look into using Amazon lockers to collect/return books? Engaging with the community – helping with home schooling?

CA – The staff have set up a Cub Club to engage with families through Instagram and Facebook. Looking at staff to contact vulnerable library members.

AP asked if there is a possibility for the library computers to be available for children not able to access computers or the internet at home?
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SC – This could be considered.

DD was encouraged by the December figures given for ebooks demand from the library and thanked SCC for collecting the data.

**FRIENDS OF STREET LIBRARY**

CAx reported that the Chair, Treasurer, Secretary and Trustee meetings have continued regularly and the first FOSL Zoom meeting had 16 members attend. Members are reminded of the FOSL responsibilities, volunteers and activities and to provide resources for the library. In the future FOSL would like to provide extras to make the library a more vibrant space.

At the opening of the library 8 loyal volunteers made sure that all the sessions were staffed. More volunteers are needed and a recruitment drive will be publicised.

DD suggesting attracting younger people to volunteer by contacting the Street Youth Club.

**ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

PF asked if a virtual tour of Street library could be put onto social media for FOSL to share.

SC – SCC to follow up

CA queried that the visitor counter was not recording correctly.

JM will check and report back.

LR asked when will SPC receive the SCC grant?

SC – awaiting confirmation of the final few payments and will organise asap.

MD asked is there a possibility of reviewing terms and conditions of the contract and can we make amendments?

SC – SCC could change how the library operates and if significant we can discuss to review.

PG suggested that the Parish Rooms becomes a community hub, with the library working alongside the Community Centre and the Salvation Army.

**Date of next meeting 28.4.21**

Meeting ended at 11.20 am

J Marshfield

Assistant Clerk Street Parish Council
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**Mendip Strategic Tourism Group**

**Thursday 28 January 2021**

**Present:**

MDC – Julie Reader-Sullivan (JRS), Kelly Knight (KK), Simon Carswell (SC)

Frome – Rachel Griffin (RG), Peter Wheelhouse (PW), Emma Parker (EP)

Glastonbury – Gerard Tucker (GT)

Mendip Hills AONB – Jim Hardcastle (JH)

Shepton Mallet – Tara Jessop (TJ)

Street – Mark Sandiford (MS), Chris Davis (Clarks Village)

Wells / MTL – Andrew Webb (AW)

Visit Somerset – John Turner (JT), Giles Adams (GA)

James North

**My Mendip**

The My Mendip website is currently being tested in the live environment by selected businesses in Glastonbury. Glastonbury and Street will be the first locations in which the website will be fully rolled out. Comments are invited on the website, and a separate meeting will be set up to discuss further.

Business Support Grant

Mendip is currently looking at possibility of busines support grant for those who currently do not have an eCommerce solution or need help with online training.

**Active Travel**

Mendip applied for central government funding of £1.5m but managed to secure £450k. One of the projects chosen to proceed is School Street, a project to reallocate road space from car to bike, with pop up cycleways.

**Mendip Multi-User Path**

Paths have been identified and land access is now being investigated. Various options are being looked at, and further information will be provided once landowners have been engaged.

**Strawberry Way**

An additional link will be added in Shepton, by Collet Park. The path will run under the bridge, and an agreement has been made with owner.

**Glastonbury Town Deal**

The application is being submitted tomorrow (29th January) for £24.5m of capital funding. It focusses on economic recovery and includes investment in areas such as the Beckery village, brides mound, the Abbey, and a park and ride scheme that will allow more people to visit the town and Avalon Marshes.

**Visit Somerset**

Sub sites are looking to go live in March. A meeting will be set up with each town to show what pages will look like. 150 free spaces are available for businesses, including retail, arts, attractions, and accommodation.

**Round Table**
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**Mendip Hills**

Cheddar had featured on County File, highlighting the problems caused by car and bike meets within the gorge. Mendip Hills have been updating website with information on transport and car park information for when COVID-19 restrictions are relaxed. Kamoot has been used to create visitor trails, and they have been looking for volunteer ranges, for which there has been lots of interest. Walkers are Welcome, which arrange walking holidays, is being considered, and the Butcombe Trail, which links 6 pubs around Mendip, is being reintroduced. Electronic infrared visitor counters are being placed to log visitor numbers.

**Frome**

Frome was accredited to Walkers are Welcome (WAW) in May 2018, which is hoped to strengthen the town as a destination and provides a free listing on the WAW website. Frome held a festival in 2018 where 86 people took part in 6 walks. In 2019 this had grown to 250 people taking part in 20 walks. 2020 was cancelled, but it is hoped that the festival will take place in November 2021. There is a range of walks planned to include pub, historical, and comedy (in conjunction with local theatre). The festivals and membership benefits hospitality, shops, and accommodation, but you are required to maintain existing footpaths and routes, whilst looking to create new ones.

**Glastonbury**

Besides the Glastonbury Town Deal, investment has been gone into creating the 7-mile Glastonbury Way. Seats and signs are currently being installed and should be completed by mid-March. Event parking for 600-700 cars has been created on the Meare Road Tor Fair site, including the installation of the old Moorland Factory gates. Glastonbury will be impacted by the cancellation of the Glastonbury Festival, and withdrawal of funding from MDC for tourist information will have also an impact. Unauthorised encampments are still an issue, but the site at the bottom of Roman Way has been cleared, making way for an orchard various fruit and nut trees.

**Shepton**

Concentrating on building capability, to promote the town with a better online presence. They are considering a tourism budget, arts budget and WAW. Also looking to sign off on a heritage trail app.

**Street**

A funding application for £55k had been submitted to the Climate Emergency Community Fund 2020-2021 to install  a combined cycle/footpath along the A39, linking Street Roundabout to the turning off the A39 towards Clarks HQ/Clarks Village car park. A Business Action Group has been set up to consider ways to improve the High Street and promote/support businesses in Street. Greenbank swimming pool has decided not to open in 2021, due to the uncertainty surrounding COVID-19, but SPC have agreed a grant to support them reopening in Spring 2022. New High Street Banners have been designed for Spring 2021, along with usual hanging baskets and planters. Are looking to produce a cycling and walking leaflet.

**Wells**

Currently overhauling data policies/GDPR for local attractions, such as the Cathedral and Palace, volunteer groups and communications.
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**Fiver Fest**

This is a Mendip wide initiative where shops and businesses are encouraged to offer promotions, such as a bundle of 5 things, items for £5, £5 off etc over a week or two-week period.

**Objectives and Strategy**

All were encouraged to consider what are the biggest issues facing the district and what can be delivered that will have the most impact.
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AGENDA ITEM NO: 17

To: Council

From: Clerk

Subject: Correspondence/Minor Issues

1. Mendip Parish Forum

The Chair, Vice-Chair and myself attended the Parish Forum in January and were informed that the District Council was devising a phosphates calculator and strategy to assess and guide applicants on what they would need to deliver. A regular update on this issue for local councils was requested.

A query was raised about the District Council’s ability to deliver services and if the council tax would need to be raised after the pandemic. It was reported that the increase for 2021/22 would be about 3% on a Band D property. There would be many unknown factors but the intention was to deliver all services with some being done in different ways.

Information would be included on the next Parish Bulletin regarding the use of speed indicator devices which should be moved regularly to be most effective. Ash dieback was a problem across the district with many trees needing to be felled at considerable cost. If a tree was affected by more than 10% it became very brittle and a tree surgeon could not climb it to remove larger branches. The need to hire a cherry picker increased the costs involved. Somerset Wildlife Trust, the Woodland Trust and the District Tree Officer would give guidance where needed.

2. Data Protection Policy

Further to the meeting on 19th January I can now report that the GDPR policies and procedures have now been reviewed and a copy of the Data Protection Policy has been circulated to members. The Council is asked to approve these documents and to agree that it does not need to appoint a Data Protection Officer as it is not handling high volumes of personal data. Approval is also sought that in the event of a data security breach etc. the services of Winckworth Sherwood would be engaged to assist as necessary.

3. Consultation – Right to Regenerate

MHCLG recently launched a consultation on proposals to reform the Right to Contest in regard to land owned by a local authority or certain other public bodies. Responses to be made by 26th February and full details attached.

This Council does not have any longstanding vacant, derelict or underutilised land but there may be areas owned by other bodies which could be affected by this. NALC has raised some concerns including the implications for council owned land that is subject to certain statutes such as allotments or village green. Question 4 asks if the right should be extended to include land owned by town and parish councils.

4. Temporary Road Closure – Orchard Road

Orchard Road will be closed from 15th February for 5 days for Bristol Water to carry out new supply works.
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5. Section 106 Agreement – Relocation of War Memorial

In accordance with Standing Order 22 a to authorise the execution of the confidential draft Section 106 agreement for the relocation of the war memorial within Merriman Park as circulated to members only. This to be signed by the Chair and Vice-Chair or any 2 councillors and witnessed by the Clerk as the Proper Officer. It was agreed in October 2020 that the Clerk would read through the agreement and legal advice would not be necessary. The agreement is needed to obtain the necessary listed building consent and this should be obtained now in readiness for when the memorial is to be moved.

L.A. Ruff

Parish Clerk

16.02.21
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PC1-21 | RIGHT TO REGENERATE

Summary

The Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) have recently launched a consultation seeking views on proposals to reform of Strand 2 (land owned by a local authority or certain other public bodies) of the Right to Contest under the Local Government, Planning and Land Act 1980 operated by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government.  The main consultation document can be downloaded from the gov.uk website – Public Sector Land Use – Right to Regenerate: reform of the Right to Contest.

Context

Currently longstanding vacant, derelict or underutilised public sector land can have a significant impact on the attractiveness of a local area, sometimesacting as a focus for anti-social behaviour. Since 1980, the public has been able to request that the government considers whether certain publicly owned land is unused or underused, and if so direct that it be sold (under strand 2 of the right to contest).  NALC has been liaising closely with MHCLG since last Autumn on this right and currently local councils have the power to invoke the right to challenge other defined public sector landowners ‘s under use of land, and refer such cases for consideration to MHCLG.

The government wants to empower people to challenge the inefficient use of public sector land in their communities, and to bring it into better economic use, including to provide new homes. The government is consulting on the effectiveness of these requests as it considers reforms to make the process more efficient and more transparent.

The government believes that reforming the Right to Contest and relaunching it as a new ‘Right to Regenerate’ could provide a quicker and easier route for individuals, businesses and organisations to identify, purchase and redevelop underused or empty land in their area. In turn (the government believes), a strengthened right would support greater regeneration of brownfield land, boost housing supply and empower people to turn blights and empty spaces in their areas into more beautiful developments.

Currently local councils are not in the list of public landowning bodies which can be challenged under this right – but this consultations seeks views on whether local councils who own underused or derelict land should indeed be challengeable under this right in the future.

NALC Concern:

NALC is concerned that developers will be tempted to approach local people and remunerate them for putting their names on the challenges being made.  Whether local councils are subsequently subjected to the 'Right to Contest' or the 'Right to Regenerate', there needs to be a requirement about how the land or buildings are subsequently dealt with after they are passed on to ensure that developers are not tempted to use a front to acquire land or buildings, perhaps at below market value.
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In addition NALC has some other minor concerns regarding the new right to regenerate as below:

·         That semi-natural wildlife areas become deemed to be ‘under-used’.

·         Given the government’s pro-developer stance, will any land that is transferred in this way be given some kind of ‘prior permission’ status, thereby by-passing the normal planning system?

·         What mechanism will be available to adjudicate between competing claims for the same piece of land?

·         What are the implications for council-owned land that is subject to certain statutes, such as allotments or village green?

·         Assuming local councils were to be added to the Schedule 16 list, would all of them have to produce regular reports, or just those where requests have been made under the ‘right’?

Consultation Questions

The main consultation questions NALC will be responding to in this consultation are as below and NALC seeks the views of county associations and member councils in response to these questions to help inform its own submission to MHCLG:

Increasing the usefulness and effectiveness of the right

**Q1: Do you consider the Right to Contest useful?**

**Q2: Do you think there are any current barriers to using the right effectively, and if so, how would you suggest they be overcome?**

Making it clearer when land is unused or underused

**Q3: Would a definition of unused or underused land be useful, and, if so, what should such a definition include?**

Extending the scope of the right

**Q4: Should the right be extended to include unused and underused land owned by town and parish councils?**

**[NALC Supplemental Question:** Do you think that this proposal could lead to a back way in for developers to acquire redundant council-owned land and buildings?]

Land where a public body has an intended use

**Q5: Should the government incentivise temporary use of unused land which has plans for longer term future use?**

A greater role for local authorities

**Q6: Should the government introduce a requirement for local authorities to be contacted before a request is made?**
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Presumption in favour of disposal

**Q7: Should the government introduce a presumption in favour of disposal of land or empty homes/garages where requests are made under the right?**

Publicity and reporting

**Q8: Do you agree that the government should require these publicity measures where requests are made under the right?**

Right of first refusal

**Q9: Should government offer a ‘right of first refusal’ to the applicant as a condition of disposal?**

Conditions attached to disposals

**Q10: Should the government impose conditions on the disposal of land? And if so, what conditions would be appropriate?**

**Q11: Do you have any additional suggestions regarding reforms that could improve the effectiveness of the Right to Contest process?**

Your evidence

Please email your responses to this consultation to [chris.borg@nalc.gov.uk](mailto:chris.borg@nalc.gov.uk) by 17.00 on Friday 26 February 2021. County associations are asked to forward this briefing onto all member councils in their area.
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AGENDA ITEM NO: 19

To: Council

From: Clerk

Subject: Accounts for Payment

The latest bank reconciliations for all accounts at 31st January 2021 have been prepared successfully and sent to all members with the monthly income and expenditure by account report and earmarked reserves. Each reconciliation and original bank statement will be signed by Councillors Carswell and Prior as part of the monthly check of accounts when guidance allows and Councillor P. Goater is doing an online check.

Receipts and payments are detailed on the attached pages and a final report for February will be sent to members in early March.

L.A. Ruff

Clerk

16.02.21

Approved by Council on 16th February 2021 and initialled by Chair:
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