

# The Grove Residents Steering Committee

Inaugural Meeting – Saturday 1 March 2025 at 4pm

At No.1 Brownes Way Café, Hallow

## Attendees:

Dom F, Mathew C, Kate W, Paul W, Adrian A, Glenda A, Osasu A, Paul R, Alison R, Edward H, Sarah P, Andrew A, Judith K, Liz W and Mike L.

## Discussion Points:

1. Thirteen dead trees, hedgerows and wildflower meadow
2. The Annual General Meeting (AGM), associated invoice due date and access to online meeting
3. Ground Solutions quotes for works
4. General Risk Assessment (GRA)
5. Reserve funds and protection of funds
6. Payment of funds to Piper Homes development for access road
7. Adoption of Hayfield Grove roads
8. Steep ramp in Banks Close
9. Hayfield Homes Ltd legal planning obligations
10. Handover to resident directors
11. Any other business

## Actions:

No.	Headline	Action Detail	Action Lead
1	Planning Obligations	RSC to contact Malvern Hills Local Planning Authority (LPA) to Lee Walton (Head of Planning) to see if we can make contact and build relationship with the LPA, but to also ascertain; start and finish times of the planting scheme, when do the LPA consider the start and when exactly is the finish date? Also sight of CEMP, LEMP, EDS and Agreement between Hayfield and LPA regarding the specified boundary hedgerow heights.	DF to send email to Lee Walton at Malvern Hills Planning and Infrastructure team.
2	Ecology report and confirmation of completion of planning obligations	RSC to ask the local planning authority when the ecology visit will be conducted and report drawn up. If the visit has happened, can we have a copy of the compliance report? If not yet, please can we know when the meeting is so a resident can be present? The RSC are confident the planting scheme has not been finished. There is a missing tree (reported to GS and Hayfield by Rob Wilks) so if the planting scheme is not finished (ecologist to confirm) the Hayfield remain liable for the costs to bring it to a finished state ready for handover to the residents. RSC to state that we are keen to ensure the bio/enviro elements are in place and all conditions met. Malvern Hills are keen to ensure the green elements of the planning are not impacted.	DF to send email to Malvern Hills to understand who is due to visit and when.
3	Planting Scheme and Planning Obligations	RSC discussed the wildflower meadow areas of the open space opposite Potters Meadow and after discussions with gardener Rob Wilks on site on Friday 28 February 2025, we understand that the areas defined as wildflower have a) not been seeded to a sufficient amount of wild seed mix and b) that it appears that the areas defined as wildflower have been regularly over mown in the last season by Hayfield's contractor PGE, causing the wildflower	DF to liaise with the LPA to seek advice.

		<p>areas to potentially become inert and may never recover. Due to this damage the RSC wish to seek the input of the LPA ecologist to give advice on reparations if the condition within the planning obligations have been breached which the RSC believe Hayfield remain accountable for as it was PGE that was contracted by them during the last season.</p>	
4	Dead Trees	<p>The RSC remain resolute that the 13 dead trees were planted by PGE, under the direction of Hayfield Homes and that due to lack of post planting care and lack of irrigation during their first months, the original planting company (PGE) remain responsible for their poor installation of the trees. There should be a 12-month warranty for the trees, and we ask that PGE and Hayfield take responsibility for this.</p>	<p>DF to include within response to Hayfield and Ground Solutions.</p>
5	Hedgerows and Planting Scheme	<p>Hedgerows were also discussed, with two main hedges of concern. The hedge around the outer edge of the development bordering Greenhill Lane is stipulated within the planning obligations to be maintained at a specified height to be agreed with the LPA, but the RSC require sight of this written agreement from Hayfield and the LPA. The RSC believe that this has been completely missed by Hayfield during the build phase and should now be resolved at their cost. Secondly the hedge between the Hayfield and the Piper development (the "ransom strip") has not been attended to either. The area around the hedge on the Hayfield side is messy and with Piper Homes and their associated management company going into administration, there needs to be an understanding of the responsibilities in maintaining this area of the grounds between each site. Managing only one side of it is not appropriate.</p>	<p>DF to include in correspondence back to Hayfield and Ground Solutions to make enquiries.</p>
6	Adoption of Roads	<p>RSC discussed the proposed adoption plan of the roads within the Hayfield Grove development but were unsure a) whether this is being taken forward by the Worcester County Council (WCC) highways authority and b) when this was likely to happen.</p>	<p>AA will reach out to the WCC highways authority to obtain more information and understand the proposals and timelines for adoption.</p>
7	The Annual General Meeting and payment of Invoice	<p>Residents have agreed that despite the AGM currently being scheduled after the invoice due date, and the cost of the dead trees being applied to the schedule, it is each resident's personal and legal obligations to make full payment by the due date to ensure that the funds are sufficiently built to pay for works and agree that these are as a condition of the TP1 signed on purchase. If Hayfield decide to payback reserve funds to GS for the replacement of the dead trees, then the funds will have surplus in the come the end of the year. RSC require that GS provide additional transparency on amassing funds going forwards and ask GS that they confirm the insurance levels applied to funds in reserve. GS are to make sure that funds do not exceed the insured level.</p>	<p>Action on all residents to ensure payments are made on time.</p> <p>RSC to continue to compel Hayfield to complete their planning obligations as per the LPA conditions and seek payment.</p>
8	Rescheduling of AGM meeting	<p>RSC remain discontent that the AGM has been scheduled after the invoice due date. The RSC have discussed that the first AGM meeting should in face</p>	<p>DF to contact NI at GS to establish a new date and time for a F2F AGM meeting on site.</p>

		be face-to-face and that the RSC will propose to GS that a F2F meeting is the preferred option, and to ascertain a new date from them. Preferably before 20 March. The RSC ask that GS attend with copies of the submitted quotes for all the works for the residents to review.	
9	RSC Roles	Finally, the RSC agreed that fewer individuals from the RSC should engage with GS to ensure one consistent voice.	DF to liaise with Hayfield and GS re the RSC's concerns, DF to reach out to MH LPA regarding the planning obligations, and AA to liaise with WCC to progress road adoption matters.

Residents are asked to provide their email addresses privately to Dom F (via WhatsApp) if wishing to be included in the distribution of email communications with any of the actions above.