

Agenda



Liaison Meeting with Community Councils

Date: Thursday, 23 June 2016

Time: 6.00 pm

Venue: Committee Room 1 - Civic Centre

To: Councillors Bishton, Coedkernew, Goldcliff, Graig, Langstone, Llanvaches, Llanwern, Marshfield, Michaelstone-y-Fedw, Nash, Penhow, Redwick, Rogerstone and Wentlooge

Item		Wards Affected
1	<u>Apologies for Absence</u>	
2	<u>Minutes of the Previous Meeting held on 24 March 2016</u> (Pages 3 - 6)	
3	<u>Paper-less Planning Consultations</u> To discuss paper-less planning consultations received by Community Councillors.	All Wards
4	<u>Shared Community Charter</u> To discuss any issues which might fall under the Charter.	All Wards
5	<u>Items Raised by Community Councils</u>	All Wards
a	<u>Road Maintenance in Rural Areas</u>	

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes



Liaison Meeting with Community Councils

Date: 24 March 2016

Time: 6.00 pm

Present: A Whiting and J Davies (Bishton, Graig, Marshfield, Penhow and Wentlooge), G Price (Head of Law & Regulation), T McKim (Information Governance Manager), R Cornwall (Partnership Manager), A Lowe (Planning Contributions Manager) and
Anne Jenkins (Democratic Services Support Officer) and Gareth Price (Head of Law & Regulation)

1 Apologies for Absence

A Cox (Nash Community Council) and G Hancock (Langstone Community Council).

2 Minutes of the Meeting Held on 24 September 2015

The Minutes of the meeting held on 24 September 2015 were submitted.

Agreed:

That the Minutes of the meeting of 24 September 2015 were approved.

3 Matters Arising

Concurrent Expenditure

The Concurrent Expenditure for Community Councils had been referred to the scrutiny work programme, where a recommendation would be made to the Cabinet Member. In the meantime, however it was noted that the current funding allocations would fall into this financial year. One of the options was not to provide any monies to community councils however the Council had a better than expected settlement from Welsh Government therefore that option was fortunately ruled out.

Community Council representatives asked if Community Councillors could provide their input into the recommendations of scrutiny. This would be the decision of the scrutiny review group however, they would be reluctant for it to turn into a bidding war or become an adversarial process. Scrutiny was fully aware of the preferences of the Community Councils and would therefore be able to digest the information and draw a conclusion on whether Community Councils should become involved. If there was a need for further information there could be scope to engage with Community Councils before a final decision was made. Finally the Chair estimated that the work would be completed over the next couple of months and reiterated that scrutiny had all the information before them.

Paperless planning consultations

A representative of Marshfield Community Council expressed his concern regarding the withdrawal of paper plans to community councillors during the planning consultation process. As some community councils have poor Wifi reception it was felt that it was vital to receive information through the post.

Difficulties were experienced with viewing plans via computer including the scale perception of drawings.

The Chair noted the concerns of the community councillors and suggested writing to the Head of Regeneration, Investment and Housing. The East Area Development Manager had written to those community councils that complained however it was up to the Planning officers to note the concerns of the community councillors. The Chair did suggest that an officer from Planning might come along to a future meeting if the matter was not resolved by the community councils.

A representative for Marshfield asked about the provision of a temporary encampment with Gypsy & Travellers. The Chair explained briefly how the Council dealt with Gypsies & Travellers and how the council reacted to issues as and when they occurred, ie planning enforcement or trespass of land, there was however, no policy in place for temporary encampments.

Discussion ensued regarding temporary and unofficial sites within rural areas. The Chair suggested contacting A Jenkins with any concerns or Planning Enforcement, with this in mind, an officer could be invited to attend a future meeting to discuss issues concerning community councils in relation to enforcement and injunctions regarding transit sites.

4 **Understanding Communities - Ward Profiles**

A presentation was made by the Information Governance Manager and Partnership Manager outlining the ward profiles.

A brief background was given highlighting the development and concept of profiles, including the Single Integrated Plan and One Newport Local Service Board.

A system for data analysis enabled information between stakeholders to improve services as well as gather information on education, community safety, health, employment, age, etc. The Information Government Manager gave a broad example of the statistics collated within each ward within Newport and how these compared overall with figures in Wales. This information was available through a system called Atlas on the Newport City Council Website.

Community councillors were interested to hear that Newport was the fifth most deprived area in Wales and general discussion ensued regarding the information compiled by Newport.

A Jenkins was asked by the Information Governance Manager to send a link to Community Council clerks: <http://www.newport.gov.uk/atlas/en/Home.aspx> (*opens link*).

Additionally, as part of the presentation, the Partnership Manager briefly outlined the Wellbeing of Future Generations (Wales) Act. The Act was about improving social, economic, environmental and cultural wellbeing of Wales. It would make public bodies in the Act think more about long term issues, work better with people, communities and each other as well as taking a joined-up approach to preventing problems.

The community councillors could find out more or provide their input by contacting Anne Jenkins.

A representative for Marshfield Community Council asked if Atlas would take into account unauthorised use of land by gypsies and travellers. The Information Governance Manager advised that this was not currently included in their data but it could be. Statistics were retrospective so it might take a while to bed in but in theory the information could be made available.

Bishton Community Council referred to fly tipping and if information was also part of the profile. The data was available for service areas and could be used to gather data for fly tipping.

Lengthy discussion ensued regarding fly tipping and the resulting increasing problems within the rural areas. It was therefore suggested that an officer from Streetscene attend a future meeting to discuss this matter.

Wentlooge representatives were eager to provide information regarding fly tipping within their area in order to contribute to the gathering of data for their ward profile. A Jenkins could be contacted to forward information to the Information Governance Manager.

A copy of the presentation would be sent to all clerks for information and circulation.

The Chair thanked the Information Governance Manager and Partnership Manager for their insightful and informative presentation.

5 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule

The Planning Contributions Manager gave a presentation on the draft charging schedule, outlining the following points:

- The Section 106 (S106) planning obligations, contributions and monetary allocations.
- The adoption of CIL, residential rates, retail rates and infrastructure, including the infrastructure development plan, neighbourhood plan and next steps.

The adoption of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) would take place by the end of 2016 following two publications.

In response to Councillor Cornelious' query, affordable housing projects were exempt from these charges.

A table of costs of CIL was broken down into areas. The cost did not apply to a self-build single dwelling however the homeowner would have to live in the premises for three years before selling the property. Areas where affordable housing was greater, CIL would be charged at a higher rate.

Community Councillors asked whether the Council would provide competitive rates to draw developers towards Newport. The charges were governed by the Local Development Plan (LDP). Figures were still being processed via independent examination in relation to what the charges should be.

Discussion ensued on where and how monies could be spent within Newport. The monies would be distributed to the ward area where the development was taking place.

A neighbourhood plan would need to be in place if any development was within community councillors boundaries. Developers were entitled to see what the money was being spent on via a transparent trail.

The Planning Contributions Manager advised those present that if they required further information relating to the information discussed, they could do so by contacting A Jenkins.

The Chair thanked the Planning Contributions Manager for his presentation.

6 Future Meeting Dates for 2016

The following dates were agreed:

23 June, Committee Room 1 at 6pm

22 September, Committee Room 1 at 6pm

8 December, Committee Room 1 at 6pm