



## *Our plan – Our future*

### **Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan**

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

17th December 2012, 4.30pm to 7.00pm, Guildhall

#### **PRESENT**

#### **REPRESENTING**

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

Tim Coleshaw	Community
Bob May	Community
Charles Teaney	Community
Liz Thomas	Community
Rachel Walmsley	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
Jake Berriman	Shropshire Council
Faith Smith	Technical Writer

#### **Minute Taker**

Robert Toft

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

Mike Grace welcomed those present to the meeting.

#### **2. Apologies**

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

#### **3. Declarations of Pecuniary Interest, Dispensation or Bias**

There were no declarations of interest, dispensation or bias.

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

The following amendments were noted to the draft minutes of the meeting of 3rd December:

Item 3 (1st Para, Line 2) Replace "declare a bias" with "declared a bias";

Item 5 (9th Para (Action Point) under "To discuss progression of drafting the Plan with the Technical Writer and to agree any necessary actions", Lines 1 and 2) Replace "map production" with "presentation materials";

Item 5 (2nd Para under "To consider suggested policy/options from authors of Objectives", Line 5) Replace "maintain the policies" with "advise on the need for new facilities";

Item 5 (3rd Para under "To consider suggested policy/options from authors of Objectives", Line 3) Replace "proposal to teat" with "proposal to treat";

Item 5 (3rd Para under "To consider suggested policy/options from authors of Objectives", Line 5) Insert "to each other" after "in close proximity";

Item 5 (4th Para under "New Land Proposal (Station Road)") Break paragraph after first sentence to create new paragraph.

Subject to these points, the minutes of the meeting of 3rd December were **approved**.

(Faith Smith arrived at the meeting)

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

Mike Grace noted that the main focus of the meeting would be on what needed to be done before the consultation events on 12th January.

To consider and review outcomes of recent meetings with landowners and agencies

##### *Meeting with English Heritage*

Robert Stuart said that English Heritage wanted to know more about what plans might be made by owners of other historical assets. He noted that they had no specific issues to raise on flooding issues or other policies. Liz Thomas thought that English Heritage had not thought in detail about Wenlock Priory. She noted that they wanted to know whether there was an update on conservation areas in Shropshire. Milner Whiteman thought that these had not been updated since the last revision.

In summary, Mike Grace noted that English Heritage had not offered specific advice or help apart from that in their email of 19th November.

**ACTION: Robert Stuart and Liz Thomas to consider what aspects raised by English Heritage could be included in the text of the Plan.**

*Meeting with Housing Associations and Shropshire Council*

Lesley Durbin noted that Severnside Housing had not been able to attend this meeting. Shropshire Housing had indicated that they would be able to build housing developments of any size - with 25 houses being a large development by their standards. They would expect to build some market housing for sale to fund social housing. She added that they normally worked by acquiring land which was not of high value wherever possible and by working closely with communities and town and parish councils.

(Jake Berriman arrived at the meeting)

Bob May noted that minimum spatial standards might be included in designs which could match the Parker Morris standards. Robert Stuart noted that the Shropshire Housing Group business model was based on a subsidy from building market housing.

In summary, Mike Grace noted that Shropshire Housing Group would be willing to work with the community to bring forward housing as required.

Jake Berriman noted that Shropshire Council had put aside £300,000 for funding community led development, normally giving back £3,000 for every house delivered to the community. He confirmed that working with housing associations could be included in a neighbourhood plan.

*Meeting with Wenlock Estates*

Robert Stuart noted that the meeting with Tim Motley had discussed the several proposals put forward by Wenlock Estates.

On proposal "D" (south of Stretton Road), Tim Motley had accepted that the flood attenuation pond effectively prevented development of the full site, though a smaller site might be developed.

On proposal "G" (north of Stretton Road) it had been agreed that the land adjacent to the road might be appropriate for development and that development by a housing association might be acceptable.

On proposal "O" (behind Sytche Lane), Tim Motley had been told that the Steering Group thought that only part of the proposed development would be appropriate and he had accepted that this proposal was speculative.

On proposal "C" (east of Bridgnorth Road), Tim Motley had noted that the option granted to Persimmon Homes was in process of being extended and he had not shown much flexibility on exploring alternative options, although had noted that there were flood attenuation

possibilities in the park. Bob May noted that there had been some discussion of whether the proposed roundabout and affordable housing could be traded. Tim Motley had been asked to consider alternatives since this would assist in enabling the Plan to support the proposal and it had also been suggested that a development brief for the site should be prepared.

Jake Berriman noted that it was possible to say what was wanted and how much was sought from the landowner and for the Plan to indicate how development was envisaged through and beyond the period of the Plan, e.g. by proposing a number of small releases over the period.

Lesley Durbin noted that the residents survey had shown a clear wish for developments of less than 25 houses. David Turner noted that the figure of 25 was arbitrary. Lesley Durbin agreed but noted that a majority of respondents had preferred developments of less than 10 houses.

Bob May noted that it would be necessary to present options at the public events on 12th January. Lesley Durbin agreed and noted that it should be clear that these were in accord with survey findings.

On proposal "H" (opposite petrol station), Tim Motley had agreed that this would only be relevant if there was a need for land for a new police or fire station.

On proposal "S" (between Station Road and Bull Ring), Tim Motley had agreed that this would only be relevant if a new community hall was needed.

#### To consider and agree proposed content of the Plan

Mike Grace noted that he, Charles Teaney and David Turner had outlined the requirement for presentation materials at a meeting with Mike Ashton of MA Creative but there was a prior need to think more about site allocation handling. Robert Stuart thought that it needed to be agreed whether options on land proposal "C" should be put up for consideration. Bob May noted the need to change the development boundary for proposal "C" in respect of market housing and hoped that there would be a further response from Wenlock Estates/RPS before the consultation events.

On proposal "D", Mike Grace said that it had been agreed that the part of the site not needed for flood attenuation could be suitable for light industry and noted that a check on its viability for this purpose would be helpful. Lesley Durbin wondered whether it would be viable as a housing site. Bob May and Jake Berriman noted that no other industrial sites had however been proposed. Jake Berriman confirmed that Mike Grace's suggestion that development subject to the agreement of a development brief with the community could be included in the Plan.

#### *Housing Options*

Mike Grace asked whether the option not to propose housing development should be offered for consideration. Bob May thought that it would be useful to include this to show the extremes. Mike Grace noted that this would allow for development of exception/in-fill sites.

Jake Berriman noted that Shropshire Council would have difficulty with this option since it was necessary to demonstrate that a supply of development land would be forthcoming. If there was not a willing landowner it could not be demonstrated that housing would be built. He noted that he had thought that development of about 80-100 houses would be proposed.

Lesley Durbin noted that affordable housing needs over the next five years needed to be met. She noted that this would include about 10-15 owner-occupied housing and about 10 rented from housing associations.

Bob May noted that the interpretation of the survey results needed to be considered. He was concerned that the assessor could reject the plan if no housing development was proposed. Lesley Durbin noted that the residents survey had shown support for moderate development.

(Mary Jacobs arrived at the meeting)

Milner Whiteman thought that proposal "C" should be offered for consideration and noted that it would provide some affordable housing.

Mike Grace queried why not providing for housing development was not in conformity with the Shropshire Core Strategy since a range of between 0-500 houses in the Much Wenlock area had been included in this. Jake Berriman noted that the conformity issue was not about the number per se but rather about the need to ensure a continuing supply and whether such a proposal would be acceptable for the town's future. He noted that it would be possible to re-run the SAMDev consultation again if security of supply became an issue.

Mike Grace asked whether using compulsory purchase to guarantee supply would be an option. Jake Berriman thought that this might be possible.

Charles Teaney noted that over 100 houses would need to be built if the affordable housing proportion was set at 20% and 25 houses were needed.

Mike Grace noted that at the other extreme, supporting proposal "C" and allowing for exception sites and single development elsewhere would provide for a substantial amount of housing. Robert Stuart noted that proposal "C" did, however, exceed the desired single-site threshold even if development was phased. Milner Whiteman felt that the option of supporting the proposal should be put forward since it had not really been clearly offered previously to the public. Bob May noted that there had been some inconsistency of approach in the residents survey questions.

Charles Teaney asked if there would still be consistency of supply at the end of five years. Jake Berriman noted that development could be balanced by plans elsewhere in Shropshire if affordable housing was guaranteed. Charles Teaney noted that it would be necessary to review the plan regularly.

Lesley Durbin noted that not enough affordable housing would be provided with a proportion of 13% but that, if this were changed to 20%, then it would be easier to meet the demand. Robert Stuart noted that single affordable housing would be included in the totals. In response to a question from Mike Grace, Jake Berriman confirmed that the overall number of houses proposed was appropriate but that it was necessary to secure the required amount of affordable homes.

Bob May thought that proposal "C" could be supported, particularly if 20% affordable housing were provided and suggested that different options should be offered for consideration. He noted that development in Stretton Road and Sytche Lane was also possible.

Robert Stuart thought that it would be difficult to demonstrate conformity with the Core Strategy if development was limited to exception sites.

Mike Grace thought that there were three options for housing: i) To propose no development and seek compulsory purchase of land where necessary to guarantee supply; ii) To support proposal "C" as specified; iii) To support a modified proposal "C" with a greater proportion of affordable housing, phased development and more reliance on exception sites.

Jake Berriman wondered if it would be possible to go back to landowners after the public events of 12th January. Charles Teaney noted that little time was available to do this if other deadlines were to be met.

Lesley Durbin noted that it needed to be made clear at the event that the CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) did not apply to affordable housing.

#### To design and agree actions for 12th January consultation events and meetings to develop the content of the Neighbourhood Plan

Faith Smith noted that detail on the nine objectives should be available by 4th January and suggested having a poster for each objective with charts indicating findings from the residents' survey. She thought there was a need to give a steer on priorities and conflicts between them. Jake Berriman noted the need to reference the Much Wenlock Town Design Statement.

Mike Grace noted the need to write three scenarios and notes on non-acceptable sites.

**ACTION: Mike Grace to produce a scenario based on supporting limited development and Bob May and Robert Stuart to produce scenario(s) based on supporting proposal "C" with possible modifications.**

Rachel Walmsley noted that a map of sites with accompanying text would be valuable.

Jake Berriman asked when policies would be available. Faith Smith said that full detail would be available shortly after 12th January but that non site-specific policies would be available before then.

(Jake Berriman left the meeting).

**Agreed** that there would be an informal meeting of Steering Group members on 28th December at 10am. Charles Teaney agreed to see if this could be held at the Raven Hotel.

(Faith Smith and Liz Thomas left the meeting).

**ACTION: Charles Teaney to re-draft the poster and flyer for the public event on 12th January.**

## **6. Date of Next Meeting**

The next formal meeting of the Steering Group was **agreed** to be on 2nd January 2013, starting at 9am in the Guildhall, with a further meeting on 7th January at 5pm at which the dates of further meetings would be agreed.

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

Date \_\_\_\_\_