



## ***Our plan – Our future***

### **Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan**

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

19th November 2012, 5.00pm to 7.00pm, Guildhall

#### **PRESENT REPRESENTING**

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

Tim Coleshaw	Community
Bob May	Community
Charles Teaney	Community
Liz Thomas	Community
Cllr. Lesley Durbin	Much Wenlock Town Council
Cllr. Robert Stuart (Chair)	Much Wenlock Town Council
Cllr. David Turner	Much Wenlock Town Council

##### **In Attendance**

Mary Jacobs	Community
Rachel Walmsley	Community
Gill Jones	Shropshire Council

##### **Guest**

Stephen Hay	Warwick District Council
-------------	--------------------------

##### **Minute Taker**

Robert Toft

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

In the absence of Mike Grace, Robert Stuart was elected as Chair for this meeting. Robert Stuart welcomed those present to the meeting and, in particular, Stephen Hay from Warwick District Council.

#### **2. Apologies**

Cllr. Mike Grace	Much Wenlock Town Council
Cllr. Milner Whiteman	Much Wenlock Town Council

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

Robert Stuart noted that the Town Clerk (Sharon Clayton) had circulated a note to members of the Group which gave guidance on disclosure of pecuniary interests. Living close to a site

under consideration did not of itself constitute a pecuniary interest, although members might wish to declare a bias on this basis.

It was noted that "Dispensation and Bias" should be added to the title of this item at all future meetings.

(Rachel Walmsley arrived at the meeting)

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

The following amendments were noted to the draft minutes of the meeting of 12th November:

Item 5 (4th Para under "Land Proposal A", Line 2) Add " The intention was that these should be converted into policies" after "design and sustainability.";

Item 5 (3rd Para under "Land Proposal B", Line 1) Replace "Agreed" with "It was suggested";

Item 5 (3rd Para under "Land Proposal B", Line 2) Add " However, it was agreed that a site visit would be undertaken." after "to be developed";

Item 5 (1st Para under "Land Proposal C") Delete this paragraph;

Item 5 (6th Para under "Land Proposal C", Lines 1 & 2) Replace "was not appealing" by "needed consideration"

Item 5 (6th Para under "Land Proposal C") Delete 3rd and 4th sentences of this paragraph;

Item 5 (under "Land Proposal C" ) Add new 10th paragraph "Agreed that a second site visit should be undertaken";

Item 5 (3rd Para under "Land Proposal C", Lines 2 to 4) Replace "wondered whether the existing designation of employment land in the town should be kept and whether existing sites should be re-used." with " said that consideration should be given as to whether the existing designations of employment land in the town should be kept.";

Item 5 (under "Land Proposal D" ) Add new 5th paragraph "Agreed that a second site visit should be undertaken";

Item 5 (under "Land Proposal F") Move 2nd paragraph after 4th paragraph;

Item 5 (under "Land Proposal G" ) Add new 5th paragraph "Agreed that a second site visit should be undertaken";

Item 5 (under "Land Proposal H", Line 1) Add "or police" after "health";

Item 5 (under "Land Proposal H", Lines 1 & 2) Add "it lay uphill and access was not good" with "part of it lay uphill, access to part of it was not good and that the lower part had a number of mature trees";

Item 5 (under "To design and agree further activity to develop the scope and content of the Neighbourhood Plan", 1st Para) Replace "Charles Teaney and Liz Thomas" with " Liz Thomas and, possibly, Charles Teaney".

Subject to these points, the minutes of the meeting of 12th November were **approved**.

Robert Stuart noted that the Town Clerk had suggested that it was not necessary to include names in the minutes, except where actions were involved, or to record discussions in detail. Lesley Durbin and Charles Teaney thought that the inclusion of additional information gave greater transparency and allowed the public to see that a discussion had taken place. Robert Toft thought that, although the Steering Group was formally a sub-committee of the Town Council, the community's role in developing the Plan was important and he had sought to produce minutes which would be interesting to read by the community and not just for reference purposes.

**Agreed** that the minutes of the Group should remain in their existing format but that they should be condensed in size where possible.

(Tim Coleshaw and David Turner arrived at the meeting)

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

### To consider and review suggestions for premises and land

Robert Stuart noted that there had been a second site visit on 15th November by some members (Robert Stuart, Mike Grace, Liz Thomas and David Turner) of the Steering Group and that Mike Grace had produced a consolidated note covering both site visits. He noted that objectives would need to be measured against proposals at subsequent meetings but that the present meeting would concentrate on sites, looking first at those not considered at the meeting on 12th November.

#### ***Land Proposal "J" - Land north of Sytche Caravan Park***

The first site visit group had thought that this land was too high and would have a negative visual impact on important countryside. Bob May thought that relevant aspects of the proposal could be dealt with when looking at policy development.

#### ***Land Proposal "K" - Land at Sytche House (Old Quarry Site)***

The first site visit group had noted that there were already three static caravans on the site and thus a change of use might be involved. They had also thought that the four houses proposed might be too many given space required for parking.

#### ***Land Proposal "L" - Sytche Caravan Park***

The first site visit group had noted that if housing was developed on the site it could be to the detriment of tourism and leisure and that the 30 homes proposed exceeded the community's preferred limit of 25 on any one site and would have an adverse visual impact from Shrewsbury Road. David Turner noted that "eco-friendly" had no specific definition for planning purposes and that the proposal needed to be considered as involving either housing or caravans. Lesley Durbin thought that the site was not suitable for permanent dwellings. She noted that if caravans were involved it would be better treated as a policy issue.

In summary, Robert Stuart noted that the Group was uncomfortable with the proposal for permanent or semi-permanent dwellings and that the alternative leisure and tourism use should be considered under policy development.

#### ***Land Proposal "M" - Land off Southfield Road***

Bob May noted that this site was currently farmland and that it would be possible to use the whole field or to build just a small row of houses. He thought that it would be important to identify what exactly would be presented for public consultation. He added that there was currently a connecting footpath but the site had poor access, particularly for the earth-moving equipment needed for building. David Turner noted that any houses built would look over existing ones. Charles Teaney noted that Shropshire Council had not thought this site suitable for development and this view had been supported by the community in the residents survey. Lesley Durbin thought that a new road would be needed if the site was completely developed.

In summary, Robert Stuart noted that there were problems with access and visual impact and that the site's suitability for housing needed to be assessed against other proposals.

#### ***Land Proposal "N" - Land & Premises at Wheatland Services Ltd.***

Charles Teaney noted that the site had been thought suitable for the development proposed although Bob May noted that it might not necessarily feature in the Plan. David Turner thought that the proposal could be submitted as a normal planning application.

Robert Stuart noted that the Plan would need to include appropriate policies to develop a robust retail sector.

***Land Proposal "O" - Land off Sytche Lane, adjoining Meadowbrook House***

Bob May thought that it would be possible to extend development along Sytche Lane but not to the extent specified in the proposal. Lesley Durbin thought that this was an important site, particularly for affordable homes and that, if not accepted, the affordable homes target would not be met. David Turner wondered if this target might not be met from the total of affordable homes over several other sites. Lesley Durbin asked whether the target was taken to apply from the current position or from that previously allocated in planning and noted that she had assumed the former.

Robert Stuart noted that existing policy had been to avoid concentration of any one type of housing in particular areas. Charles Teaney thought that there were social advantages in encouraging housing diversity.

Liz Thomas noted that surface water run-off was likely to be a problem in this area. Charles Teaney noted that access would need upgrading if further development took place. Lesley Durbin noted that the site was, however, close to open space.

***Land Proposal "P" - Land fronting Stretton Road, adjoining the existing commercial complex***

Robert Stuart noted that this proposal was somewhat odd since part of the area had been identified previously by Shropshire Council as land for a flood attenuation pond and it was this which would be likely to be supported.

(Minute-Taker's Note: It was subsequently determined that the land covered by this proposal did not include that identified as land for flood attenuation ponds).

(Mary Jacobs arrived at the meeting)

***Land Proposal "Q" - Sytche Brook, adjacent to The Sytche Caravan Park  
Land Proposal "R" - Shylte Brook, upstream of Bridge House, Stretton Road***

Agreed that both these proposals for flood attenuation ponds should be supported.

***Land Proposal "G" - Land north of Stretton Road***

Robert Stuart said that on the second site visit it had been noted that part of this site might be appropriate for local food production or designated green space. It might be possible to develop the lower section for housing, but there were issues associated with access and overlooking existing housing.

***Land Proposal "I" - Land at Walton Grange***

Robert Stuart noted that those on the second site visit had also agreed that the site was not suitable for tourist or other types of development. Bob May suggested that tourism aspects

should be considered when developing relevant policies. Charles Teaney thought that the lower part of the bank was less visible and thus might be more suitable for development.

### **Land Proposal "B" - Land at Homer**

Robert Stuart noted that those on the second site visit had agreed that there did not seem to be a need for the housing development proposed.

The meeting **agreed** with Robert Stuart's proposal that sites identified for possible development by the public should be considered during the policy development stage.

**ACTION: All authors of the Objectives were asked to propose possible options/ policies, taking into account comments from October's drop-in sessions.**

To consider progress on engagement of drafting expertise to write the Plan and agree any necessary actions

Robert Stuart noted that only a single application had been received for the technical writer tender. He noted that there had been some problems in placing the advertisement.

Lesley Durbin (friend) and Liz Thomas (previous experience) declared a possible bias in respect of the applicant.

Robert Stuart noted that the applicant had indicated that they could meet the proposed timescale and the terms of the brief.

**Agreed** that the next meeting needed to include further discussion about the work of the technical writer.

To design and agree further activity to develop the scope and content of the Neighbourhood Plan

Mary Jacobs outlined her proposal for consultation on the draft Plan, involving an exhibition at the Museum, which she noted had been drawn up against the background of a challenging timetable. Lesley Durbin thought that the Museum was a good venue but would only be open from Friday to Sunday in December.

Rachel Walmsley was concerned that that there was little time for drafting and agreement of policies. Robert Stuart noted that draft policies could be presented. Lesley Durbin noted that theme leaders needed to pick out policies on which collective decisions could be taken.

David Turner expressed concern about mounting an exhibition until at least a skeleton plan had been agreed. He thought that that quality of the presentation might suffer or be left to a very small number of people, particularly since available time was limited in December.

Rachel Walmsley noted that if this was to be the last consultation it needed to be inclusive. Robert Stuart thought that ideally it would be the last but questioned whether this was feasible.

Bob May felt that it was not reasonable to have a draft plan ready in time. He thought that much of the plan would not be contentious and that the concentration of effort should be on looking further at the preferred sites and consulting on these, especially those which involved housing. He added that there might be a second consultation on the draft. David Turner agreed with an initial concentration on sites but noted that 18 sites had been put forward and time would be needed to communicate with all of the owners and proposers.

It was **agreed**:

- i) That the public consultation would focus on land and that a date for this would be arranged later;
- ii) Consultation needed to be set up with landowners of preferred sites and with housing associations.

Robert Stuart noted that Mike Grace had produced a note on information which needed to be made available for the technical writer and asked Group members to think about this. Bob May noted that that a column could be usefully introduced to indicate whether the proposal would be included under site-specific or policy sections of the Plan.

**Agreed** not to publish any information on preferences/decisions on proposed sites until all relevant discussions had been concluded.

## 6. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Steering Group was **agreed** to be on 26th November, starting at 5pm in the Guildhall, with a further meeting on 3rd December. Further meetings would be held fortnightly after this date.

Signed -----  
Chairman

Date -----