



## *Our plan – Our future*

### **Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Plan**

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

5<sup>th</sup> March 2012, 5:00pm to 7:00pm, Guildhall

#### **PRESENT**

#### **REPRESENTING**

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

Vivien Bellamy	Community
Bob May	Community
Cllr. Lesley Durbin	Much Wenlock Town Council
Cllr. Mike Grace (Chair)	Much Wenlock Town Council
Cllr. Matthew Green	Much Wenlock Town Council
Cllr. Robert Stuart	Much Wenlock Town Council
Cllr. David Turner	Much Wenlock Town Council

#### **In Attendance**

Mary Jacobs	Community
Simon Ross	Community
Charles Teaney	Community
Jake Berriman	Shropshire Council
Mark Plummer	DCLG

#### **Minute Taker**

Robert Toft

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

Mike Grace welcomed those present to the meeting.

#### **2. Apologies**

Howard Horsley	Community
Liz Thomas	Community
Cllr. Milner Whiteman	Much Wenlock Town Council
Gill Jones	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 20<sup>th</sup> February:

Item 2 (Line 3): Delete "(CT)";

Item 3 (Line 2): Delete "Mary Jacobs";  
Item 4a (Action): Replace "Simon's book (launch events)" by "launch events comments book";  
Item 4b (2<sup>nd</sup> Action): Replace "Horsely" by "Horsley";  
Item 7b (1<sup>st</sup> Action): Replace "Mike Grace" by "Matthew Green";  
Item 11 (Line 1): Replace "Points" by "Items".

Subject to these points, and some tidying of format to be undertaken by David Turner and Robert Toft, the minutes were **approved**.

## 5. Project Programme Review

Charles Teaney noted that the programme was behind schedule on agreeing the format and contents of the community survey and on developing the required web application. He thought it important to have the web application sorted soon.

**Agreed** that this needed to be agreed with Sara Botham but that the questionnaire needed to be finalised first.

*(Simon Ross arrived at the meeting)*

Mike Grace thought it essential to agree the timetable to the end of March at this meeting. He noted that the Town Clerk had sought tenders for the survey print contract. Bob May and Robert Stuart thought that it would take at least two further weeks to finalise the questionnaire. Bob noted that significant changes had been proposed in the revised drafts from Mike Grace and Matthew Green. The size was probably too large and agreement was needed on whether only Neighbourhood Plan related questions should be included. David Turner suggested a separate meeting of four or five Steering Group members together with Sara Botham and Faith Smith to produce a final version for full group approval.

**Agreed** to leave further discussion on process until the end of the meeting.

## 6. Community Survey

### Structure and Format of Survey

Mike Grace noted that revisions proposed, including Matthew Green's version with further questions on housing needs which had only just arrived, were tending to take the questionnaire away from the original plan but he thought there was a need for consistency of approach. He felt that it was necessary to take a "hard-headed" approach to bring down the overall size.

Jake Berriman wondered whether there should be an initial exploratory questionnaire which would scope a later survey. David Turner thought that there was a limit on both volunteers' time and their capacity to advise respondents. He thought that realistically it was only possible to do a single community survey at this stage.

Mark Plummer thought that it was important to ask most questions about information which was not known from other sources, such as Shropshire Council. Robert Stuart said that it was necessary to have up-to-date findings and to present a body of evidence to the

planning inspector.

*(Matthew Green arrived at the meeting)*

Lesley Durbin said that she and Howard Horsley (as other members of the Housing Needs theme group) would need further time to consider Matthew Green's revisions. Matthew apologised for slowness in producing the revisions and for suggesting an unrealistic timescale.

Charles Teaney queried whether it was worthwhile including questions on which little could be achieved through the neighbourhood plan such as improved broadband and some of the questions on sustainability. Jake Berriman and Lesley Durbin noted that such questions could, however, provide information which could be taken forward by Shropshire Council and the Town Council.

Robert Stuart and Mike Grace suggested the possibility of having two documents, with a guide/explanation separate from the survey questionnaire. Bob May felt that the questionnaire should be self-explanatory and stand-alone and David Turner thought that a single document would be simpler and would maximise response. Jake Berriman thought that a separate guide would enable explanation of those elements not directly relevant to the questionnaire. Matthew Green thought that two documents were better since the guide could explain the process as well as the survey. No information on the Neighbourhood Plan had previously been circulated to all households and a single document would leave respondents without any information after its completion and return.

**Agreed** that there should be two documents with a separate guide/explanation and a "bare-bones" questionnaire.

#### Content of Survey

##### **A. Housing needs**

Matthew Green noted that housing needs arose from different origins and that it was important to understand the context. There were those housed together who would wish to be separate, those in unsuitable accommodation and emergent households e.g. younger people. Further needs included those effectively forced out of Much Wenlock (e.g. on cost grounds) and those living outside who would wish to move to the area. His proposed questions had kept to the first three of these types of need since they were answerable by residents but it was also necessary to think about housing needs which were not estimated. Robert Stuart noted that some information on external demand needs might be obtained through the business survey.

Matthew Green expressed concern about different responses being received from the same household and wondered whether housing questions should be limited to one response per household. David Turner noted, however, the difficulty of asking questions about other people's needs. Lesley Durbin noted that housing needs were separate to housing growth, in which all residents were interested, and that respondents needed to be clear what they were being expected to answer. Robert Stuart suggested putting questions on needs, as opposed to views on housing, at the end of the questionnaire for completion only by those to whom these questions were relevant.

Matthew Green thought that questions on quantity as opposed to location of housing growth were of limited value. He had taken out questions likely to yield similar answers such as the desirability of good design. Bob May and Jake Berriman thought that more specific questions on design might be

included. Matthew thought that similar questions on housing and employment should be included e.g. asking where there should not be development.

### ***B. Jobs and the local economy***

**Agreed** that questions B3/B4 (on type of site and location of land for employment use) should be similar to questions on land for housing use.

Lesley Durbin thought that “working from home” in question B6 needed a fuller explanation.

### ***C. Protecting our environment***

Vivien Bellamy noted that there were no questions included about the quality of new build or the built environment or links to the Much Wenlock Design Statement. Jake Berriman thought that questions could build on the principles of the Design Statement.

### ***D. Creating a sustainable community***

Bob May queries the value of questions on issues such as public transport and photovoltaic (PV) panels on which the Neighbourhood Plan would not impact. Simon Ross thought that the questions might not be quite right but thought that this information would be valuable. Mike Grace noted that there was little available information on this area and a wish to see development of, for example, community PV might be taken forward. Lesley Durbin said that the earlier public meetings and roadshows had shown a lot of interest in all sustainability issues, including public transport.

### ***E. Improving community services***

Mark Plummer noted that the last question (on better leisure/recreational facilities) needed some indication of priority since otherwise all choices might be supported equally.

Mike Grace appealed for volunteers to meet and produce the final draft of the questionnaire with Sara Botham and Faith Smith (if available). Howard Horsley had indicated he would take part. Vivien Bellamy volunteered. Mike, Simon Ross and Matthew Green were also willing to help finalise their specific areas of interest.

**ACTION: David Turner to speak to Sara Botham regarding possible meeting dates within the next seven days and to liaise with others on these.**

**Agreed** that the questionnaire would need to be signed off at the next meeting (19<sup>th</sup> March).

*(Mary Jacobs arrived at the meeting)*

## **7. Engaging the Volunteers**

Mary Jacobs distributed a note on survey volunteers which was now fairly complete although she would be doing some further work on mapping with Howard Horsley. Steve Cunningham had agreed to lead the survey volunteers and would take on recruitment and briefing. He would be given a copy of the original volunteers list and would follow up contacts.

Lesley Durbin noted that the Town Council insurance covered up to 30 volunteers. She suggested that deliverers/collectors might have a badge.

## **8. Developing the Plan Themes**

Mike noted that progress on all themes had been achieved. Bob May said that all the proposed work to date on the "Jobs and the local economy" theme had been completed but that he was not clear about the next steps.

**Agreed** to revisit the area of theme development in detail in April, after the survey questionnaire had been issued.

## **9. Media & Communications**

David Turner requested that comments on the draft article for the April Wenlock Herald should be sent to him as soon as possible.

He sought volunteers for transcribing comments from the roadshows and primary school event and for working up the notes on the social landlords' meeting. Lesley Durbin offered to work on the latter. It was thought that Liz Thomas would be able to help with the primary school event transcription.

**Agreed** that David Turner would liaise with Robert Toft on other outstanding transcription work.

David proposed that he should ask Paul Hutchinson of Virtual Shropshire if he would make a video clip for the website.

**ACTION: Mike Grace to ask the Neighbourhood Plan Committee of the Town Council to authorise commissioning and funding of a video clip.**

**Agreed** that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) needed to be better explained on the website.

## **10. Outstanding Actions**

There were no outstanding actions not discussed elsewhere on the agenda.

## **11. Budgets**

It was noted that further provision for travelling expenses needed to be made.

**ACTION Mike Grace to remind the Neighbourhood Plan Committee of the Town Council of the need to support travelling expenses incurred on Neighbourhood Plan work.**

## **12. Date of Next Meeting**

This was agreed to be 19<sup>th</sup> March, starting at 5:00 p.m. in the Guildhall.