



## *Our plan – Our future*

### **Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan**

#### **Minutes of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group**

20th August 2012, 5.00pm to 7.00pm, Guildhall

#### **PRESENT**

#### **REPRESENTING**

#### **Members of the Steering Group**

Bob May	Community
Charles Teaney	Community
Liz Thomas	Community
Cllr. Mike Grace (Chair)	Much Wenlock Town Council
Cllr. Robert Stuart	Much Wenlock Town Council
Cllr. David Turner	Much Wenlock Town Council

#### **In Attendance**

Gill Jones	Shropshire Council
------------	--------------------

#### **Minute Taker**

Robert Toft

#### **1. Chairman's Welcome**

Mike Grace welcomed those present to the meeting.

#### **2. Apologies**

Tim Coleshaw	Community
Mary Jacobs	Community
Rachel Walmsley	Community
Cllr. Lesley Durbin	Much Wenlock Town Council
Cllr. Milner Whiteman	Much Wenlock Town Council
Jake Berriman	Shropshire Council

#### **3. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

#### **4. Minutes of Last Meeting**

The following amendments were noted to the draft minutes of the meeting of 6th August:

Item 5 (4<sup>th</sup> Para, Line 1): Replace "learning time" with "reading time";

Item 5 (5<sup>th</sup> Para, Line 3): Replace "precede to" with "proceed to";

Item 5 (6<sup>th</sup> Para, Lines 1 & 2): Replace "the right person to undertake the assessment" with "a person with appropriate insight into the concept of neighbourhood planning to undertake the assessment";

Item 6 (1<sup>st</sup> Para under "Consider Consolidated Proposals for Neighbourhood Plan Objectives and Agree Actions", lines 1 to 3): Replace "Housing needs, Jobs and the local economy and Community services had been drafted but not for Sustainable community or Local environment" with "Housing Needs, Jobs and the Local Economy and Community Services had been drafted but not for Sustainable Community or Local Environment";

Item 6 (2<sup>nd</sup> Para under "Consider Consolidated Proposals for Neighbourhood Plan Objectives and Agree Actions", lines 1 & 2): Delete "noted that policy contained in planning documents was differently treated in each. He" after "Bob May";

Item 6 (6<sup>th</sup> Para under "Consider Consolidated Proposals for Neighbourhood Plan Objectives and Agree Actions", line 4): Delete "with two or three themes" after "objectives";

Item 7 (1<sup>st</sup> Para, Line 1): Replace "Objectives" by "Options";

Item 7 (1<sup>st</sup> Para, Line 2): Insert "based on the current schedule" after "of October";

Item 7 (1<sup>st</sup> Para, Line 3): Replace "how much flexibility there was in timings" with "whether there were legal or statutory requirements not reflected in the plan";

Item 7 (9<sup>th</sup> Para, Line 3): Insert ", given the experience with the survey distribution" after "considered further".

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

## **5. Developing the Scope and Content of the Plan and the Themes**

### To Consider and Agree the Plan Objectives for Further Consultation

Mike Grace thanked those who had provided revised objectives. At present there were nine objectives including those on Community Services revised by Robert Stuart (which had not been circulated due to technical problems). He noted that that an introduction would be needed and invited comments from the group.

Gill Jones thought that the redrafted objectives were essentially sound but needed a little tweaking.

Liz Thomas enquired whether the objectives would be finalised at a given date. Mike Grace said that this would be necessary since they would be going out to the public. He noted that the objectives would need to be approved by the Neighbourhood Plan Committee of the Town Council.

Robert Toft thought that the main text of the document circulated to the public should be short with supporting detail perhaps being put into an appendix. Robert Stuart agreed and noted that references could also be made to other plans and documents to shorten the text. Mike Grace thought that the main text could consist of the objectives themselves, why they had been proposed and what issues should now be considered.

Bob May thought that housing objectives should appear first. He thought that issues concerning sustainability might need reallocation. Robert Stuart noted that Simon Ross had thought that sustainability issues might permeate other objectives.

David Turner noted the need to be clear in communications, including areas about which there was uncertainty. He thought that that the Town Council also needed to consider the objectives. He felt that it was important to check that all aspects of the survey response had been considered and reflected in the Neighbourhood Plan if appropriate. Charles Teaney thought that some indication should be given of what had happened if particular aspects had not been included.

Robert Stuart noted that it might be possible to go back to the community and ask what had been intended by particular responses. Liz Thomas noted that the support for local food production was unclear and asked whether the Plan should allow for the possibility of fields being given for this purpose. Mike Grace noted that care needed to be taken as to what was sought and thought that, for example, polytunnels would not be supported. David Turner noted that it should probably be clarified that locally produced food would be for human consumption.

Charles Teaney noted that appropriate change of use needed to be allowed for.

Mike Grace noted that it was necessary to look at the development management policies of Shropshire Council alongside the Core Strategy. He thought that it was not necessary to "nail down" the objectives as yet since they were subject to consultation.

**ACTION: Tim Coleshaw and Simon Ross to agree the details of objective(s) relating to local food production.**

It was **agreed** that there should be about 10 objectives in the consultation document.

Bob May thought that the objectives document needed an editor to ensure a common format, style and usage, e.g. of percentages and references, and thought that Mike Grace was best placed to do this.

Robert Stuart **agreed** to check that all the major survey elements and responses had been picked up in the objectives. Mike Grace noted that it would also be important to check that the right interpretation of the responses had been made.

### *Objective 2 (Housing needs)*

Charles Teaney thought that the housing objective as currently drafted contained elements of policy (particularly the maximum number limits) and would not thus allow sufficient flexibility in meeting them. Bob May agreed that objectives should not be too prescriptive in order to enable landowners to show how they might address them.

Mike Grace noted the need to balance flexibility with the need to reflect the responses to the specific questions which had been posed in the survey. He thought that it was also important that the objectives should be specific to the local area.

Robert Stuart thought that it was important to leave sufficient flexibility such that proposals which might meet several objectives could be considered. He suggested that this issue might be included as an item in the Issues and Options sections of the consultation document.

Bob May was concerned about including a maximum number of 100 houses. He thought that it should be indicated that most respondents preferred a maximum of 50 houses together with discussion of how this might be achieved and what type of housing should be included. Mike Grace noted that questions about the mix of housing had not been included in the survey. He would reflect the discussion when editing the document and agree revisions with Lesley Durbin.

### *Objective 1 (Local economy and jobs)*

Charles Teaney thought that "resisting" change of use might need to be softened or qualified.

Bob May asked if the mapping of site designations in the Neighbourhood Plan would replace existing site designations. Mike Grace confirmed that it would and that the Plan could also change, and even possibly abolish, the existing development boundary.

### *Objective 3 (Sustainable community)*

Mike Grace noted that the issues and options section needed to be drafted. Bob May thought that many of the elements currently included dealt with climate change issues rather than sustainability *per se*.

### *Objective 4 (Local environment - development reflecting scale, style and setting of townscape)*

Mike Grace **agreed** to clarify where the text referred to the town or to the parish as a whole.

### *Objective 5 (Local environment - development retaining and creating open space)*

Mike Grace noted the possible need to include further issues and options.

### *Objective 6 (Local environment - management of countryside)*

It was **agreed** that this needed to be tidied and that more specific points on quarries might be needed.

### *Objectives on Community Services*

Robert Stuart **agreed** to put these objectives into a common format and to circulate them to Steering Group members on the following day.

### To assess Objectives against the Core Strategy and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Gill Jones **agreed** to raise this issue with Jake Berriman but noted that he was currently on leave.

### To Agree Further Activity towards Drafting the Plan

Mike Grace **agreed** to edit and re-draft the objectives paper and to incorporate the Community Services objectives drafted by Robert Stuart.

It was **agreed** to hold a meeting to finalise the objectives on Tuesday 28th August at 9am.

**ACTION : Robert Toft to finalise the list of addressees for consultation.**

### To Design and Agree Activity to Develop the Scope and Content of the Neighbourhood Plan

Mike Grace said that he had approached Planning Aid about facilitation and was expecting a response shortly but wondered if they would be able to undertake the work in the required timescale. He thought it might also be desirable to commission work from graphic designers.

It was **agreed** to recommend that the Neighbourhood Plan Committee endorse a single-tender approach with MA Creative based on their past experience and to approve expenditure of up to £2,000 for materials and facilitation supporting public presentations.

## **6. Media and Communications**

David Turner noted that no further action had been taken on booklets distributed around the parish. **Agreed** to wait until the objectives had been finalised before considering further action on booklets.

Mike Grace wondered whether a condensed version of the objectives could be included in the September Wenlock Herald. **Agreed** that the objectives would not be finalised in time for this and to accept the existing draft article with minor amendments.

(Gill Jones left the meeting)

Bob May noted that Earls Barton had issued a pro-forma for those interested in suggesting sites for development. **Agreed** to discuss this issue further at the Steering Group meeting on 3rd September.

## 7. Plan Timetable and Processes

Mike Grace noted that the Neighbourhood Plan area designation application had attracted no objections during the consultation period and would be considered for approval at the Shropshire Council Cabinet meeting on 12th September.

Charles Teaney said that he had incorporated all of the steps proposed in the planning paper from Mary Jacobs. He thought that the revised plan and timetable should be reviewed further. **Agreed** to consider this at the Steering Group meeting on 3rd September.

## 8. Date of Next Meeting

This was **agreed** to be on 28th August, starting at 9am in the Guildhall. The following meeting would be held on 3rd September at 5pm and further meetings would be held fortnightly after this date.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

Date \_\_\_\_\_