

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF KINVER PARISH COUNCIL HELD ON WEDNESDAY 5<sup>TH</sup> APRIL 2017 AT THE COUNCIL OFFICES AT 95 HIGH STREET, KINVER**

PRESENT: Councillor H Williams (Chairman), Mrs L Hingley (Vice-Chairman),  
Councillors: , IG Sadler, DH Hadlington, D Light, J Irving-Bell, N Other, JK Hall, Miss V Webb, BR Edwards, G Mander and P Wooddisse

OPENING PRAYERS - Cllr Mrs L Hingley led the Council in prayer.

52. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors J Cutler, Mrs D Geoghegan and Mrs C Allen sent their apologies to the meeting due to other commitments.

53. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

Councillor N Other declared a pecuniary interest in relation to item 59 as he is a Church Warden.

Councillors Mrs L Hingley and D Hadlington declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to Item 58.

54. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS

The Minutes of the meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2017, having been circulated in advance of the current meeting, were approved and signed as a true record of the proceedings at that meeting.

55. MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

55.1 Noticeboard at Iverley

The Clerk has written to Elite Taxis at the registered address and the envelope has returned unopened "not at this address". This was noted.

55.2 Car park recycling

The District Council car park opposite the Parish Office has a clothes recycling bank on it. The area around this bank is very untidy and is being used as a dumping ground for other waste as it's a "recycling centre". Mr Perry of the District Council is looking at getting this bank removed, and the Clerk has sent photos of the mess surrounding this bin. In addition if the bin was removed it would free a further parking space on the car park. This was noted.

56. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

For note: The public participation is for the public to address the Parish Council on matters that they wish to. The Parish Council cannot comment or resolve action on any points raised at this time. If the item requires information being sent from the Council, the Clerk will do this following the meeting. If it is a matter for further discussion it may be added to a future agenda.

No members of the public present wished to speak.

57. VULNERABLE ROAD USERS AWARENESS TO DISCUSS PRINTING OF LEAFLETS

*Councillor D Hadlington as prepared a draft leaflet to highlight awareness for vulnerable road users and also a sticker design to go on cars and buses. He asked that the Parish Council consider funding the printing of the items. It was agreed that the Clerk circulate to all members the leaflet draft and if the County logo is required on the document then permission needs to be given from John Trebles. This matter was deferred until the next meeting when members have looked at the leaflet.*

*It was agreed that the Clerk write to Mr Ellis to ask when the press release he agreed to send is being sent out, so that any correspondence sent by the Council does not go out at the same time.*

This matter was referred to the Finance Committee. The Clerk will investigate other funding sources from the County, District and Police Commissioner also.

58. AFFORDABLE HOUSING ON BROWNFIELD AND GREENBELT SITES

The following information was received from Cllr D Hadlington:-

The disparity in the allocation of affordable housing on brownfield or green belt.

It came to my attention at the District Planning forum that on brownfield sites there is a requirement to build 30% affordable houses but on green belt sites it is 40%. Why the disparity I asked? I was told, and understand, the cost of remedial work on brownfield site makes it impossible to build affordable homes as the costs outweigh the discounting of affordable homes. In short COST. This policy is surely going to be a social and economic disaster. Whilst appreciating the villagers wish to have their children to be able to live in the same village when they start their adult life and work, a large proportion may just as well wish to move elsewhere. 40% is not a true reflection of this. More important though is the plight of the people the policy is trying to help. Generally speaking, those who NEED affordable houses are the people who do not have well paid jobs, more often in poorly paid low skilled work, if employed at all. Car ownership is often out of their reach and a reliance on good bus/train transportation or the ability to walk to work is vital.

In our village, as with all villages, there are very few jobs except for a few seasonal farm jobs, the shops are dearer, buses are not regular, trains none. So how are these affordable houses helping the people who need them?? The plethora of, suitable jobs, transportation, and convenience of large shopping centres in cities and large town's makes far more sense for these people in need of an affordable home. Housing them away from their jobs and infrastructure in a more expensive village environment is certain to make them less well off, and in turn make the villages worse off and cities poorer too.

So the cost to builders should not be the be all and end all in deciding where the affordable homes are built, it should be based on the peoples requirements who actually need these homes. The 30% and 40% figures are therefore seriously flawed and in need of a serious re-think. Villages in green belt areas obviously need less affordable homes than cities and towns, where the people in need of affordable homes presently live and wish to continue to live, as it suits their requirements.

To continue with the figures suggested is akin to the issues caused by high rise flats or the pre-fab homes of yesteryear, we will be responsible the biggest social economic failing in history.

I urge this Parish to support this being sent to our district for a serious review.

Response from Councillor BR Edwards...

**Response to the issue raised at Kinver Parish Council – The disparity in the allocation of affordable housing on brownfield or Green belt.**

This note provides a response to the note prepared by 'Doug' for the meeting of Kinver Parish Council on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2017.

Doug had attended the recent Planning Masterclass we held and queried why there was a difference between the affordable housing requirements on brownfield and Greenfield sites. The response at the masterclass outlined that as brownfield land requires more remediation work, and thus more cost, to make it suitable for development, providing 40% affordable housing does not make the development viable and hence 30% is required on brownfield sites.

The Council's approach to delivering affordable housing as planning gain on S106 sites is predicated on 2 issues; the need for affordable housing and the cost of delivering it. The Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) in 2012 indicated there was a significant need for affordable housing in the district equating to a shortfall of 338 units per year. The study was carried out using the methodology and guidance published by the Department for Communities and Local Government in 2007 and as such formed a key part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy, the housing policies within it, and particularly our approach to delivering affordable housing. The SHMA also indicated that to meet the scale of this shortfall we should consider a target of negotiating for 40% affordable housing on Greenfield sites and 30% on brownfield sites.

In addition we have also had to assess whether this level of requirement on developers was viable in the local market based on land values, build costs and sales values. Again as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy, independent consultants confirmed that the proposed approach of 40% on Greenfield and 30% on brownfield sites was viable to bring forward housing development and this approach, and the evidence underpinning it, was accepted by the Planning Inspectorate and adopted in our Core Strategy in 2012.

In his note Doug has also raised a number of concerns about developing affordable and the necessity of it in rural areas which tends to run contrary to perceived wisdom on the subject. Providing affordable housing on suitable sites helps create balanced communities and assist in the future vitality of villages ensuring local people can stay in their community. Many young people are priced out of the communities in which they and their families grew up in and by not looking to deliver more affordable housing in our villages we run the risk of our rural areas becoming the preserve of the wealthy and the isolated elderly. Some people will want to move to urban areas but some won't so we need to be looking to cater for these people.

House prices are significantly higher in rural areas pricing younger people out of these areas which in turn can have knock on effects on local services including schools, post offices, pubs, shops and bus services. It also impacts on family support networks if younger people are forced to move away both in terms of care for older family members and child care support for younger ones. Indeed we have been approached by some villages who actively want more affordable housing because they have recognised that a lack of it is affecting the ability of young people to stay in their communities and the future vitality of those villages.

Affordable housing is also not just for young people and can be provided for older people and can help provide homes for people to downsize to and thus freeing up family homes.

Without them older people may have to move out of the communities in which they grew up and raised their families and can also save the public purse by being in a property more suitable to their needs, which could reduce the need for costly social care services.

Affordable housing is not just social rented housing and can also help people move onto the housing ladder through low cost home ownership options including Shared Ownership (part rent – part buy) and Starter Homes and can thus meet a range of housing needs for our communities.

The need for affordable housing in rural Britain is recognised and supported by the Countryside Alliance, the Commission for Rural Communities, the Campaign to Protect Rural England and Action with Communities in Rural England. The document in the attached link, and supported by those organisations, called ‘Affordable housing keeps villages alive’ articulates the needs and benefits particularly well - <http://www.cpre.org.uk/resources/housing-and-planning/housing/item/1932-affordable-housing-keeps-villages-alive>

In our experience demand remains high for affordable housing across South Staffordshire and the opportunity to meet some of this need by negotiating for a percentage of open market developments to be for affordable housing is necessary. There are not huge levels of housing growth planned for the District and the level of need is not as high as urban areas so we will not be talking about thousands of affordable homes being provided in rural areas.

**Grant Mitchell**  
**Strategic Development & Planning Manager – South Staffordshire Council**  
**March 2017**

Further response from Cllr D Hadlington in writing to the meeting:-

The 30% brownfield versus 40% Greenfield allocation for affordable homes is primarily down to the Big builders refusal to build homes on which they won't make a profit. It is cost to them, not the consideration of the public in need of the affordable homes.

Let me explain:

Thank you Brian for the copy we all have tonight of the policy of our Council. It was this document I referred to when I wrote my earlier document, along with consultations with a neighbouring Housing Association, Planning consultants, land agents and some of the big builders. Based on what I heard I felt I could not sit back without bringing the real story, or at least an alternative view, to this Parish. It is not because I want to overturn or change any of our Councils policies but I believe we do need to make aware of what is real, not just perceived wisdom.

Whilst not disagreeing with the report/policy Brian has provided for us, in which time and again we can read higher prices in rural areas, remedial costs, land values, costs, profits, viability (meaning costs) the public purse (costs) the conclusion, in brief, is “the emphasis of the report is too heavily weighted in favour of the Big Builders costs and profits than finding a workable solution to the plight of the public in need of affordable homes”

I am not advocating we do not need affordable homes on greenbelt sites in rural areas, I am well aware of the reasoning for our younger families in these areas, but look at the facts...: Is there really an extra 30% NEED on Greenfield rural sites for these affordable homes than in the towns and cities? Indeed where are the largest populations? Towns and Cities.

There are undoubtedly thousands of acres of brownfield sites in our towns and cities which could be built on, but would be costly to the builders. The overwhelming number of people in NEED of affordable housing live in, and work in the cities and towns. To put it simply there is no justification to upping the Affordable housing allocation of 30% to 40% in rural areas, an increase of 30%, other than cost. There is not a 30% increase in the density of population in these rural areas, absolutely totally the reverse.

I do doubt their “perceived wisdom on the subject” it is clearly just perceived, not being actual, factual or accurate, but blindly based on the Big builders refusal to build homes on which they make no profit.

Members noted the comments above.

59. MOTION SIGNED BY 5 MEMBERS RE GRASS CUTTING AT THE CHURCH

Before the motion was taken, the Clerk informed members that the budget sum for the grass cutting was still in the budget for 2017/18, she has cancelled this section of the contract with the grass cutting contractor. However, she has spoken with him and he is prepared to add it back into the contract at the same rate.

This does not need to be referred back to the Finance Committee as it is a specific budget head, item of expenditure.

Members expressed concern that this matter only being decided the month before had been brought back so quickly to Parish Council. It was noted that the Church had written also to the Parish Council stating that as the District Council would not take on any maintenance for 12 months, as it was not in their budget for this year, and there were certain items that have to be attended to by the Church before they will take it over.

The motion proposed by 5 members as attached as appendix 2 to these minutes is as follows:-

“The Parish Council continues to cut the grass for the current season, as a gesture of goodwill at the church for this season only.”

This motion proposed by Councillor Mrs L Hingley, but did not get a seconder, therefore Councillor P Wooddisse, seconded by Councillor JK Hall that the decision of this Parish Council remains the same that the grass is no longer cut by the Parish Council’s contractor as a gesture of goodwill, the responsibility now lies with the District Council. On a vote there 6 for the motion and 4 against, 1 abstention.

The Clerk will write again to the church with this decision.

60. COST OF VANDALISM THIS FINANCIAL YEAR AT THE CHILDREN’S PLAY AREA

The costings to date for the Vandalism at the Children’s Play Area are detailed below:-

Fire Damage – August 2016 £13719.46

Smashed bench – March 2017 - £500.00

Damaged wet pour under the swings from Fire damage – July £1000

Several damaged benches over the period that have been repaired by our staff circa £500.00

Total cost of damage = £15719.46

In addition to the above, the Parish Council has had to purchase a CCTV camera to cover the area at a cost of £2940.00.

In addition there is a cost of signs to be replaced for the car park as they have all been vandalised the cost to buy them was £134, they have been replaced with home-made laminated signs.

Members asked that the Clerk get some signs erected at the Play area stating the cost of the damage for the past year, and that if there is any further damage then the play area may have to be closed. The CCTV is now in operation.

This was noted.

61. OUTSTANDING MATTERS FROM THE DISTRICT / COUNTY AND COUNTY / DISTRICT COUNCILLORS TO ADDRESS THE COUNCIL ON ANY MATTERS RELEVANT TO THE PARISH

Councillor BR Edwards reported the following:-

- The pot holes in Hyperion Road have started to be filled in, the work is ongoing.
- The Stewpony pot holes are scheduled to be repaired overnight on the 24<sup>th</sup> April.
- All of the District Council's Senior Management posts have been filled.
- There are 5 candidates for the Kinver County seat in the May elections.
- He has handed in a petition from residents of Foster Crescent to have double yellow lines extending up the road on one side.

In addition it was noted, at the bottom of Foster Street joining the Enville Road, the cars are parking on the speed bumps causing a problem on a blind bend, the Clerk to contact the PCSO's on this matter.

62. REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN

The Chairman reported he and Councillor BR Edwards have been invited to attend a photo publicity shoot for the grants given by the Parish and County Council to allow the National Trust to install some new kissing gates.

63. CLERK'S REPORT

The Clerk reported on the following matters –

63.1 Bridge at the Vine

A resident has complained that car drivers are not stopping at the give way markings on the Vine Bridge. He suggests installation of Traffic Lights?

Members did not think that traffic lights were feasible or funds would be available for this from the County. However, they resolved that the Clerk contact Highways and ask for the lines to be remarked and also request that the hedge is cut back to improve visibility when entering the village. The Clerk will write back to the complainant and let them know.

63.2 We have received details of a local grave digger who asked the Council to consider employing a grave digger directly for Comber Ridge.

This can be of benefit as we control the grave digger and have a preferred person that we know works very well, but on the other side we are then liable for any complaints re the grave digging, and have to organise this rather than the Funeral Directors doing it....

There are pros and cons to taking on this extra responsibility. There may be an opportunity to increase revenue, but the down side is the management side would increase costs. Members agreed not to employ a grave digger directly and continue on with the system that we have.

### 63.3 Kinver Country Fayre

Letter re the details of the road closure that has been approved by the County Council. This was noted.

63.4 The Parish Council have been notified by the courts that they will be receiving compensation from the 2 youths that set fire to the children's play area in August. This was noted.

### 63.5 Publications to note

Churchill and Blakedown Parish Council agendas

Police information on Business Crime

Details relating to Facebook comments

CCTV Commissioners strategy

The Clerk

Photos and letter of thanks for the grant from the National Trust showing the new gates installed on the Edge

Crime statistics

### 63.5 Superintendents Report

- We have had 1 new cremation plot
- 1 headstone installed
- 1 new burial plot

The above items were noted.

## 64. COMMITTEE REPORTS

### 64.1 Leisure and Amenities Committee meeting of the 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2017

The minutes of the above meetings, having been circulated, were **Received**, the following recommendations were made to the Council:-

- that the Parish Council fund the cost to employ a company that supplies Youth Workers is £390 per month for a 3-hour session. The cost of room hire at the KSCA per month is £200.00. Total cost per annum is £4680 for the Youth Worker and £2500 for room hire, adding £820 for Contingencies giving a total cost for the first year of £8000, and the second year would be a similar cost with probably inflationary increases. Members would try to raise external funds also towards the second-year costs and look to get an external group formed to take over the running of the project. It was felt that the Project needs to have a commitment for 2 years (subject to a review before the first year ends of the success of the Drop-in Centre).

a small income will be generated towards the room hire as an entry fee / donation of a £1 would be charged.

- Council to purchase 5 rights of way footpath maps and boards at a cost £687.50, the locations to be confirmed.

The above items were referred to Finance.

#### 64.2 Planning & Development Committee Meeting of the 29<sup>th</sup> March 2017

The minutes of the above meetings, having been circulated, were **Received**, the following Recommendations in item 6 of those minutes were made to the Parish Council.

This was agreed.

#### 65. ACCOUNTS FOR PAYMENT

The accounts as set out as appendix 1 to these minutes were accepted.

#### 66. REPORTS FROM MEMBERS ON OUTSIDE BODIES

None were reported.

#### 67. ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

If there are any additional items for the next agenda these need to be with the Clerk by Monday 24<sup>th</sup> April 2017.

Future Police meeting

#### 68. DATES OF THE NEXT MEETINGS

Finance and General Purposes Committee	19 <sup>th</sup> April 2017
Planning and Development Committee	26 <sup>th</sup> April 2017
Parish Council	3 <sup>rd</sup> May 2017
Leisure and Amenities Committee	10 <sup>th</sup> May 2017

All meetings to start at 7.00 p.m.

## Appendix 1 to the minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on the 5<sup>th</sup> April 2017

### Accounts for payment 5th April 2017

<u>Chq No</u>	<u>Particulars</u>		
100903	Particular Designs	Leaflet printing	529.99
100893	R P H	Lock repairs (previously reported at estimate cost of 540)	738.9
BACS	Morelock signs	SID Sign (pro forma invoice)	3621.60

**Total** **4890.49**

<u>Chq No</u>	<u>Particulars</u>		
100904	ESPO	Supplies	62.19
100905	J R K Computer Supplies	Stationery	98.15
100906	Kinver Edge Farm Shop	Opening toilets	100.00
100907	OCL	Supplies	63.26
100908	OCL	Stones for Comber Ridge (Pro forma invoice)	1166.28
100909	P & S Contracts	Works to Comber Ridge (Pro forma invoice)	1200.00
100910	R H Electrical	CCTV installation	2940.00
100911	SCC	lease February March	664.95
100912	SCC	Recharge for repairs	304.02
100913	SWOPS	Fuel	83.94
100914	Viking Direct	Stationery	25.41
100915	Wyvern Windows	Door replacement	1034.00
100916	SPCA	Annual subs	694.00
100917	SSDC	Legal fees for car park	288.00
100918	Archer Signs	New Play Area sign	34.68
	Severn Valley Lock and		
100919	Safe	Keys cut	52.96
100920	OCL	Supplies	6.36
			<b>8756.01</b>

### List of Monthly Direct Debits

DD	Utility Warehouse	Garage electricity Over charges due a refund next month	44.31
DD	Utility Warehouse	95 High Street Gas and electricity	195.97
DD	Utility Warehouse	Kinver Edge Toilets	9.44
DD	Utility Warehouse	High Street Toilets	186.65
DD	Utility Warehouse	Mobile phone	30.65
DD	Salaries	April	4666.46
DD	Midshires	Lease and copier charges	371.69
DD	Screwfix	Supplies to complete garage	51.46
DD	Postage		106.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>5662.63</b>
		<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>19309.13</b>

### Receipts

Burial Fees		1640.00
Toilet Income		50.00
Santander	Write off balance	-2.54
N Power	Refund	168.88
Police	Office rent	2000.00
	<b>Total Income</b>	<b>3856.34</b>

