



## *Our plan – Our future*

### **Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan**

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

26th 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. Mike Grace (Chair)	Much Wenlock Town Council
Cllr. Robert Stuart	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 and wished a happy birthday to Tim Coleshaw.

#### **2. Apologies**

Cllr. David Turner	Much Wenlock Town Council
Cllr. Milner Whiteman	Much Wenlock Town Council
Mary Jacobs	Community
Rachel Walmsley	Community

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

There were no declarations of interest or bias.

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

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

Item 5 (1st Para under "Land Proposal J", Line 1) Replace "Charles Teaney" with "The first site visit group had";

Item 5 (1st Para under "Land Proposal K", Line 1) Replace "Charles Teaney" with "The first site visit group had";

Item 5 (1st Para under "Land Proposal K", Line 2) Replace "He added" with "They had also thought";

Item 5 (1st Para under "Land Proposal L", Line 1) Replace "Charles Teaney" with "The first site visit group had";

Item 5 (1st Para under "Land Proposal L", Line 7) Replace "it caravans" by "if caravans";

Item 5 (1st Para under "Land Proposal G", Line 2) Add "It might be possible to develop the lower section for housing, but there were issues associated with access and overlooking existing housing." after "green space.";

Item 5 (Under "Land Proposal B") Add new third paragraph "ACTION: All authors of the Objectives were asked to propose possible options/policies, taking into account comments from October's drop-in sessions.";

Item 5 (1st Para under "To consider progress on engagement of drafting expertise to write the Plan and agree any necessary actions", Line 2) Delete "the deadline might not need to be strictly observed since";

Item 5 (2nd Para under "To consider progress on engagement of drafting expertise to write the Plan and agree any necessary actions", Line 2) Replace "favour" with "respect";

Item 5 (2nd Para under "To consider progress on engagement of drafting expertise to write the Plan and agree any necessary actions", Line 2) Delete name of applicant;

Item 5 (3rd Para under "To consider progress on engagement of drafting expertise to write the Plan and agree any necessary actions", Line 1) Delete name of applicant and replace by "the applicant";

Item 5 (3rd Para under "To consider progress on engagement of drafting expertise to write the Plan and agree any necessary actions", Line 1) Delete gender of applicant and replace by "they";

Item 5 (3rd Para under "To consider progress on engagement of drafting expertise to write the Plan and agree any necessary actions", Line 2) Add "and the terms of the brief" after "timescale".

Subject to these points, the minutes of the meeting of 19th November were **approved**.

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

Mike Grace noted that the business of this meeting should include reviewing the position on decisions on land proposals, the position on the technical writer, next steps, engagement with landowners, housing associations and English Heritage and considering the format for the Plan.

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

Mike Grace noted that he had drafted a paper recording a summary of decisions on land proposals which had been drawn from minutes of previous Steering Group meetings but which had some gaps which needed clarification. He invited comments on this.

Robert Stuart noted that a column providing a quick reference to policies had been previously suggested. Charles Teaney thought that scoring against policies might also be useful since the second site visit had not involved any scoring. Bob May thought that scoring should not be undertaken yet since not all sites would be included as specific locations in the Plan. Gill Jones thought that it would be difficult to score against policies until they had been more fully conceived. Robert Stuart thought that scoring should not be undertaken at present and Mike Grace noted that it needed to be done on a corporate basis.

Subject to the above comments, the draft content of the paper was **agreed**.

### ***Land Proposal "A" - Bradley Farm - Riding for Disabled***

Robert Stuart noted that "Activity Centre" should be added to the description of this proposal.

### ***Land Proposal "C" - Land east of Bridgnorth Road***

Agreed that this proposal was of interest subject to further discussion with the landowner.

### ***Land Proposal "D" - Land south of Stretton Road***

Robert Stuart and Mike Grace noted that the flood attenuation scheme should have priority and noted that the size of this cut out all of the area of the proposal except part of the car park and the frontage, casting doubt on the viability of the remainder. Charles Teaney noted that the site had been available for a long time. Lesley Durbin noted that residents had indicated that they did not want to support distribution businesses.

Mike Grace asked whether a recommendation might be made for the remainder of the site. Bob May thought that development might be more likely now that the site was part owned by Shropshire Council.

In summary, Mike Grace noted that the site was considered too large for the purpose proposed and that the greater part of it was needed for a flood attenuation scheme. The remainder could be suitable for limited industrial or office use, subject to further negotiation with the landowners.

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

Bob May thought that this should be offered up for consideration by the public and noted that alternative locations for housing might be needed if Proposal "C" was not pursued.

In summary, Mike Grace noted that the proposal should be considered as a possible housing site, particularly in the lower area since it could meet the objectives for the Plan.

***Land Proposal "H" - Land opposite petrol station/Hodgecroft***

Robert Stuart noted that there was a need for a policy which set out the qualities and characteristics required for good development sites and community facilities.

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

Robert Stuart noted that policies were needed for caravan sites and for tourism more generally.

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

Mike Grace asked whether the site was inside the town development boundary. Bob May noted that it had been assumed that it was outside the boundary and might make a useful exception site. Charles Teaney noted that the site visitors had thought that four houses might be too many but that the site might be considered.

In summary, Mike Grace noted that the site might be suitable for limited housing development and proposed taking advice from Jake Berriman on the issue of development boundaries.

(Tim Coleshaw left the meeting)

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

Robert Stuart questioned whether the site might be used in connection with extension of the Wheatlands home. Lesley Durbin and Bob May noted that access problems rendered the site unsuitable, particularly for earth-moving vehicles needed for construction. Charles Teaney noted the strength of public opposition to development of this area.

In summary, Mike Grace noted that the site would not be recommended for development due to access, traffic and landscape issues and community opposition.

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

Mike Grace noted that a policy was needed to protect and enhance existing shops and to encourage retail investment, especially in and around the High Street, compatible with the scale and location of the town.

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

Mike Grace noted that it had been agreed that the site had potential for development but only along Sytche Lane and was particularly suitable for affordable homes. Bob May asked if market housing might also be supported if sufficient affordable homes were provided elsewhere. Liz Thomas noted that issues of surface water run-off would also need to be resolved.

It was **agreed** not to look further at existing sites raised by residents but noted that there was a need to think about proposals for re-development when discussing policies.

**ACTION: Mike Grace to revise the summary of decisions paper to reflect the discussions and decisions made by the current meeting.**

To consider suggested policy/options from authors of Objectives

Robert Stuart asked how the issue of flood attenuation ponds submitted by Chris Bowden should be treated. **Agreed** that Shropshire Council should comment on this and the Steering Group would then respond accordingly.

**ACTION: All new policy/options and existing relevant documents to be circulated to the Group and to the technical writer.**

Charles Teaney asked how overarching issues should be handled. Mike Grace thought that existing materials and briefings could serve as the basis for discussing these.

**ACTION: Mike Grace to contact Simon Ross to ask about relevant documents which might be sent to the technical writer.**

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

**ACTIONS:**

**(i) Liz Thomas and Robert Stuart to arrange meeting with English Heritage;**

**(ii) Lesley Durbin and Mike Grace to set up meetings with Housing Associations and Shropshire Council;**

**(iii) Robert Stuart and Bob May to arrange meetings with Wenlock Estates (Tim Motley) after the meeting with housing associations. Simon Ross would also be invited to this meeting.**

It was **agreed** that a meeting with Arthur Hill and Berry Bros would also be required.

Mike Grace asked about the timing and content of further consultation events. Robert Stuart thought that if only one event was planned this could be held later but, if two events were planned, the first might be held before Christmas. Bob May thought that the event should be concerned mainly with proposed development sites and any further information gained from meetings with landowners and housing associations.

Mike Grace thought that the theme of the event would be the key decisions that were still needed and an invitation to help make them. He noted that the next steps were the meetings with landowners and housing associations, engagement with the technical writer, weekly Steering Group meetings and arrangement of a consultation event, which would probably take place in the week commencing 7th January 2013.

**6. Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Steering Group was **agreed** to be on 3rd December, starting at 5pm in the Guildhall, with further meetings on 10th and 17th December.

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

Date \_\_\_\_\_