



Our plan – Our future

Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan

Minutes of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

14th May 2012, 5.00pm to 7.00pm, Guildhall

PRESENT

REPRESENTING

Members of the Steering Group

Howard Horsley	Community
Bob May	Community
Cllr. Lesley Durbin	Much Wenlock Town Council
Cllr. Mike Grace (Chair)	Much Wenlock Town Council
Cllr. Robert Stuart	Much Wenlock Town Council
Cllr. David Turner	Much Wenlock Town Council
Cllr. Milner Whiteman	Much Wenlock Town Council

In Attendance

Mary Jacobs	Community
Simon Ross	Community
Charles Teaney	Community
Rachel Walmsley	Community
Jake Berriman	Shropshire Council
Gill Jones	Shropshire Council

Minute Taker

Robert Toft

1. Chairman's Welcome

Mike Grace welcomed those present to the meeting.

2. Apologies

Vivien Bellamy	Community
Liz Thomas	Community

3. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

(Simon Ross arrived at the meeting)

4. Minutes of Last Meeting

The following amendments were noted to the draft minutes of the meeting of 30th April:

Item 5 (3rd Para, under "Survey Progress"): Replace fourth sentence with "The Town Clerk would be asked to store survey forms and volunteer data sheets on a daily basis.";

Item 5 (5th Para, under "Survey Progress", Line 2): Replace "where coming from" with "were coming from";

Item 6 (2nd Para, under "Next Steps for Development of Plan"): Replace first sentence with "David Turner noted that not all stakeholders, particularly landowners, would be willing to disclose their commercial interest and that some would engage professional advisers.";

Item 6 (7th Para, under "Next Steps for Development of Plan"): Replace second sentence with "He assumed that costs would be available in order to inform particularly difficult decisions."

Subject to these points the minutes were **approved**.

Mike Grace noted that Hayley Deighton from Shropshire Council hoped to meet the Neighbourhood Plan Committee of the Town Council on 1st June.

5. Residents Survey

Survey Progress

Mary Jacobs noted that volunteers had returned to collect forms where requested, although had not always been able to obtain them, and that all practicable means had been tried to obtain outstanding returns. There had been about a 60% response rate and she felt that caution should be taken in asking volunteers to return in any areas where response rates were low.

Robert Stuart reported that 436 completed paper returns had been received to date (including six where the respondent had indicated they had responded on-line). David Turner noted that there had so far been 279 on-line responses.

David Turner thought that, since considerable effort had already been undertaken to collect forms, it was probably not worth trying to squeeze out further returns. Howard Horsley was concerned that the household response rate might be rather below 60% since some households would have completed more than one return and wondered when detail on

response rates would be known. David Turner thought this would not be for about a further three weeks when the paper returns had been inputted.

Gill Jones noted that a response rate approaching 60% would be very high for a survey and thought that useful analyses of the data would be possible.

Milner Whiteman noted that it was not possible to involve all residents and that some had indicated that they were suspicious of the purposes of the survey. Bob May thought that, whilst extra returns which came in should be counted, there had been a very good response given that planning was not of interest to everyone. He suggested that a further postal communication might be made to inform residents of the opportunities for consultation.

Charles Teaney said that some respondents had not completed the housing needs section of the survey questionnaire. Lesley Durbin noted that survey returns would need to be correlated with what was already known on housing needs.

Robert Stuart agreed that he would finalise his analysis of paper copies received and the comparison with volunteer summaries. There would be a need to check this analysis against the numbers of forms input by Community Council of Shropshire (CCS).

Howard Horsley proposed a vote of thanks to all volunteers and particularly to Mary Jacobs, Steve Cunningham and Robert Stuart for their efforts in co-ordination. This was **agreed** by the meeting.

Bob May noted the need to have respondent codes for all forms distributed (including those not completed) for analysis purposes.

ACTION: Robert Stuart to send the finalised analysis of paper returns to Mary Jacobs.

ACTION: Mary Jacobs, Steve Cunningham and Robert Stuart to liaise with CCS to improve the quality of summary data.

Howard Horsley suggested that a formal letter of thanks should be sent to Steve Cunningham.

Survey Data Assembly, Analysis and Communication of Results

Mike Grace said that CCS had confirmed that they could take on the work of survey input and that their quote of about £2 per form was acceptable. He noted that the total costs of survey input should thus be about £900 - £1000. If forms were delivered to them to the end of the current week and input took about two to three weeks, the first analyses should be available by mid June. Howard Horsley and Charles Teaney suggested that it would be wise not to promise that any analyses would be available until the end of June.

Robert Stuart asked what should be done with unused survey forms. **Agreed** to recycle these except for a small number to be kept for other purposes.

Mary Jacobs noted that she had written a narrative account of the survey and Robert Stuart was looking at the draft, after which it could be promulgated.

Simon Ross noted that one respondent had mentioned to him that it was difficult to comment knowledgeably on some of the questions without further background information.

6. Developing the Plan

Next Steps for Development of Plan

Rachel Walmsley introduced her further revision of the method and methodology chart for production of the Neighbourhood Plan. Mike Grace thanked Rachel for her work and thought that the draft now reflected the work needed and the discussions at the last meeting.

Robert Stuart queried what work needed to be done relating to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) boxes which had been added to the chart. Rachel Walmsley noted that it would be necessary to discuss what had already been done on these with Shropshire Council. Mike Grace noted that these aspects would be considered at the examination of conformity stage. He asked whether Simon Ross and Tim Coleshaw might consider the SA issues as part of their work on the Sustainable Community theme.

Rachel Walmsley wondered about the timing and positioning of the landowners survey. Howard Horsley thought that this was essential and that it should take place before the second workshop and by July since headline results would be available in late June. In response to a question from Bob May, he noted that the main purpose of this survey would be to find out which landowners would be willing to provide land and which would not.

(Jake Berriman arrived at the meeting)

Rachel Walmsley noted that there would be opportunities to contribute in other ways prior to the second workshop. Howard Horsley emphasised that it was however necessary to involve all landowners so that it could be shown that the plan did not reflect the interests of only a few.

(Howard Horsley and Milner Whiteman left the meeting)

Mike Grace noted that other stakeholders would also need to be involved and that a landowner survey was not necessarily required but he thought that detailed engagement was essential.

Bob May noted that items in the methodology needed firming up and assigning to named people. He queried whether the SA and EIA requirements were optional or mandatory. Jake Berriman said that the SA was only necessary where items had not previously been

tested or considered by Shropshire Council and agreed to share relevant information. He noted however that sustainability assessment often proved useful and that it was also valuable to assess economic impact and viability. He noted that EIAs were also useful and were sometimes included in the SA and agreed to circulate a copy of an EIA.

Mike Grace thought that it was useful to have information on which sound decisions could be made and that consistency with sustainability at the higher levels of planning was important.

Robert Stuart asked whether sustainability needed to be considered with respect to car parks and noted the need to know all criteria which had to be considered. Jake Berriman agreed to share methods for site assessment.

Mike Grace thought that mapping for environmental impact could take place now but that most SA/IEA issues would be considered later. He noted the need to understand them further as part of the SWOT analysis and first workshop planning.

Bob May noted that the Much Wenlock Primary School and William Brookes School were involved in item 10 which needed amending accordingly.

Mike Grace asked that item 12 (Landowners Survey) should be moved into stage C (Identify Issues, Objectives and Develop a Vision). It was **agreed** that this should be done and that the item be called "Engagement with Specialised Groups including Landowners". Lesley Durbin thought that this should not take place until after headline residents' survey information was available to provide a context.

David Turner noted that item 11 (Business Survey) should also be later. **Agreed** to extend the end date for Stage B items 6-14 (Gather Evidence) to June 2012 to reflect this and to change stage C dates to "June to July 2012".

Simon Ross asked who would be invited to the workshops. Rachel Walmsley said that the first workshop would need to be limited to a more select group in order that discussion could be more clearly focused but that more people would be involved in the second workshop.

Jake Berriman noted that all aspects of the formal application process would need to be covered. Mike Grace asked Jake to go through the later stages of the draft method to check that these were included.

Rachel Walmsley asked about publicising the documents. It was **agreed** that the methodology diagram should be made public.

David Turner noted that the method/methodology were dynamic documents which could be changed as needed. It was **agreed** that the details of later stages should not be made too firm at present.

ACTION: Rachel Walmsley and Jake Berriman to liaise on the contents of the later stages of the method.

(Minute Taker's Note: At this point it was agreed to discuss the agenda item on Media and Communications as David Turner needed to leave the meeting early.)

7. Media and Communications

David Turner noted that the next article for local media needed to be finalised. It was **agreed** that the sentence on the response received to the survey should read "What we can say is that over 700 responses were received, which we consider to be very encouraging."

(David Turner left the meeting)

6. Developing the Plan (continued)

Actions for Implementing Next Steps

Mike Grace noted that some further work could be done at the present on SWOT analysis and possibly a "master class" on planning. He thought that team leaders could present their work to date. Bob May thought that survey results were needed to inform this work. Mike Grace and Jake Berriman noted that although no times were ideal it was useful to have early discussions.

(Robert Stuart left the meeting)

Mike Grace proposed that the Steering Group should hold a special session on the evening of Monday 21st May at which themes would be discussed and the layers of the plan could be scoped and shaped.

ACTION: Robert Toft to book venue for meeting on 21st May.

8. Project Programme Review

Lesley Durbin noted that Matthew Green was best placed to do a paper relating local housing needs to the Shropshire Core Strategy and the National Policy Planning Framework but she had not yet had a response from him on this.

ACTION: Mike Grace to contact Matthew Green regarding the Housing Needs paper.

Mike Grace noted that he and Lesley Durbin had produced and circulated a paper on SAMDev and the Housing theme which other theme leaders might find useful.

Charles Teaney noted that it would be useful to discuss the “boilerplate” language for the plan. It was **agreed** to discuss this at the session on 21st May.

12. Date of Next Meeting

The next regular meeting was **agreed** to be 28th May, starting at 5.00 p.m. in the Guildhall.