

SHERSTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

STEERING GROUP

Notes of Meeting held on Tuesday 10th May 2016 Sherston Village Hall at 7.30 pm

Present:

Mr John Matthews (JM), Mr Mike Johnson (MJ), Mr John Thomson (JT), Mrs Sarah Wood (SW), Mr John Knight (JK), Mr Anthony Price (AP), Mr Graham Hayman (GH), Mr Harry Stevens (HS), Dr Pip Petit (PP), Mr Kevin Smith (KS), Mr Graham Morris (GM), Mr Nigel Freeth (NF)

NHP / Plan = Neighbourhood Plan

1. Apologies

Apologies were given from Mrs Jo Curson.

2. Declarations of Interest

JT declared an interest in item 3A and 5.3

3. Update

Since the last Steering group meeting in December although there has not been any Steering Group Meetings, progress is being made behind the scenes. Meetings have been taking place between the landowners and Wiltshire Council regarding Sites 1A and 1B, and meetings held involving the surgery and Wiltshire Council. It was decided that until it became clear what was possible with site 1A and 1B there seemed no point in holding a Steering Group Meeting. MJ has compiled a briefing note for the group (appendix 1). The group were all previously sent this briefing note so the group was up to date with events before the meeting. JM wanted to formally thank MJ for all his tireless work on the plan 90% of everything that has been produced has come from him.

JM asked members of any updates they may have:

Vicarage – NF informed the group that the Vicarage plans are being drawn up and progressing.

Surgery – PP informed the group that it is looking into funding opportunities however with the current climate receiving any from the NHS seems very unlikely. The Surgery has got a Care Quality Commission Inspection next week and the surgery will explain that although they are aware surgery doesn't meet certain requirements that is expected, the practice is planning on building a new purpose surgery this will hopefully enable it to pass the inspection.

As previously discussed in other meetings a new surgery would safeguard the practice for the future and as MJ explained this current opportunity regarding the NHP and Site 1A and 1B appears now to be the best chance of saving it. Discussion then took place regarding the mechanics of financing the build and the complex issues regarding the land, landowners and developers.

3. A Correspondence

A developer has written to parish council informing it that the owners of Hillberry Lodge, would like a piece of land to be considered in the plan. The land is behind their home and borders onto Site 1B. This was discussed later in the meeting when JT left the meeting.

4. Next Stage of Process

MJ briefly ran through summary (appendix 1) and what was discussed on the 26th April meeting between WC and the landowners. The point of this meeting was to clarify situation and iron out any

issues, although negotiations are still taking place real headway was made so plan is back on track. WC are very keen for the NHP to gain momentum once again so as to avoid the need for them to consider any housing only allocations in their own Housing Site Allocations Development Plan and to ensure that Sherston has the protection of an up to date Neighbourhood Plan. Further progress on the GP surgery is now reliant on the NHP.

As the note explains this part of the plan now focuses on sites 1A and 1B which could potentially allow for a new surgery, land to allow the school to expand if needed, provision of public parking, 10 affordable dwellings for occupation by the elderly and/or first time buyers and about 45 dwellings including any affordable housing (subject to a viability assessment).

HS asked if there would be any financial contribution towards the sportsfield should these additional houses be built. It was noted that there will be a CIL contribution made by the developer which gives cash back for the community – which could be spent on anything that the community requires. This could go towards the building of the surgery or alternatively towards some improvements to the sports field if there is surplus of funds. A viability assessment will be needed to assess whether development on this site (Site 1) can reasonably cover the cost of some or all of the items identified in the NP – as now proposed for this site.

The study will look into issues such as potential land/house values, the village “shopping list” (i.e. the cost of provision of a new GP surgery and new changing rooms), infrastructure costs (e.g. drainage, access requirements etc.), additional parking, and the potential impact on village resources – so as to establish whether the site proposal would be viable. JT suggested that MJ contacts Nick Derbyshire at WC as he has already undertaken viability research on the site and can share information with MJ or advise who the group could employ.

MJ is continuing to compile the draft plan and has sent a briefing note to the planners at WC asking if this element of the plan (i.e. a policy that incorporates all of these site specific requirements) is likely to prove acceptable. The planners have already responded with some advice in terms of drafting and the use of correct terminology, language etc and various tweaks. They also recommended that there should be a design code when planning any developments. The group could contact FoxleyTagg for advice regarding this if needed. Discussion then took place regarding the number and type of housing, once the feasibility study is complete it will give a clearer picture of what mix of houses will deliver what the village wants.

5. Future Actions

MJ asked the following questions to the steering group:

1. Is the group happy in principle with what is being proposed in the draft NHP plan? The group unanimously agreed yes that it is happy in principle with what is being proposed.
2. Does it agree to instruct a professional to undertake a viability assessment? The group unanimously agreed that a study should be professionally undertaken. ACTION - MJ will contact Mr Darbyshire about the study and will identify a professional to undertake it ASAP. After which a meeting will be held to discuss findings.
3. Should the plan include the piece of land at Hillberry lodge? (JT had left the building). The group agreed that it should be included in the feasibility study after which a more informative decision can then be made.

MJ also asked PP if she could look into how much parking would be needed for the surgery site. ACTION - PP will speak to expert as there is an apparent formula for working out the number required.

There is to be a Annual Meeting of the Parish on the 26th of May this will be a good opportunity to update the public with what has been discussed and the options which could be in the plan. A summary will also go into the Cliffhanger even if it is more than likely an insert.

ACTION - JM will talk to Paul Ormiston about Cliffhanger insert.

6. To confirm date for next meeting –

JM asked all to attend the Annual Meeting of the Parish on the 26th of May after which there will be a Steering Group Meeting organised once the feasibility study of the site has been completed.

Meeting finished at 9.20pm. Notes taken by SW.