

SHERSTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP

Notes of meeting held on 6th May 2014

At 7.30pm Sherston Village Hall

PRESENT:

Mr J Matthews (JM) - Chairman

Mrs Sarah Wood (SW) - Admin Support

Representatives of the following Groups/Organisations

Mr Freeth (NF)	Sherston Churches
Mr Llewellyn Palmer (ML)	Sherston Pre-School
Mr Harvey (SH)	Sherston School
Mr Johnson (MJ)	Sherston Old School Committee
Mr Price (AP)	Sherston Youth
Mr Johnson (RJ)	Sherston Businesses
Mr Thomson (JT)	Wiltshire Council
Mr Knight (JK)	Sherston Allotments
Mr Minors (CM)	Wiltshire Council
Mr Price (AP)	Sherston Youth
Mr Smith (KS)	Sherston Sporting Association
Mr Johnson (RJ)	Sherston Businesses
Mrs Curson (JC)	Green Square
Mrs P Petit (PP)	Tolsey Surgery

Foxley Tagg (FT) Sally Tagg (ST) and

1 member of the public was at the meeting.

Definitions: "NHP" means Neighbourhood Plan

Item

122 Apologies for absence:

MR, SH, CM and AP sent their apologies.

JM welcomed Sally Tagg and colleague from Foxley Tagg. This firm has been newly appointed to assist with the creation of the plan and they will be funded by front runner funds. Introductions were made by all the steering group.

123 Approval of notes from last meeting

Minutes from the March meeting were approved.

124 Update

JM informed the group that a meeting was held with the chief planning officer at WC, JT, NF and JM and the Diocese to discuss the way forward with the vicarage site. The meeting was very constructive and the Diocese will be submitting a pre planning application suggested by JT and planning officer.

Housing for Elderly – Following last month's meeting talks have taken place between WC and the landowners to discuss the possible development of homes for the elderly (6 – 10 houses). JT updated the Foxley Tagg team about the land near the school and the ownership details. JT informed the group that the only concern regarding the land (first field on Sopworth Lane after school) is the presence of a large water main, which will need avoiding. JT informed the group that the general feeling from WC is very positive and a community led project is always looked on much more favourably than a commercial one. The planning permission is only regarding the area in question.

This opportunity is time restricted so a decision cannot wait until the NHP is completed however homes for the elderly and the young have been on the NHP wish list from the beginning of the process. The question of identifying the need was raised by a member of the public. JT informed the group that there is a need and only this week one elderly couple despite living in Sherston for most of their lives have had to move to Malmesbury due to no available properties. PP agreed with JT that there is a need for this age group but needs to be quantified by asking the community.

Surgery - the surgery have talked to firms regarding building a new establishment and are currently looking into costs and funding avenues other than the NHS.

125 Correspondence - Mr and Mrs Shipsey have sent further details regarding their land that they would like to be considered for housing. JM will talk further with them about exactly how much of the land highlighted is up for consideration. FoxleyTagg will analyse the site and report back at the next meeting.

126 Introduction by FoxleyTagg

ST informed the group that they have looked at the schedule for the Sherston NHP and is running through it stage by stage. The 1st stage is accumulating new evidence, which they have been looking at already. Then they looked at existing material and conducted a more scientific assessment.

126.1 Site Analysis

After analysing all of the sites that to date have been put forward by the various landowners, FoxleyTaggs summarised their thinking as follows:

Sites Discounted– i.e. those considered unlikely to be appropriate for future development (taking into account all of the relevant planning criteria):

- Site 2 - too remote from settlement
- Site 14 - too remote from settlement
- Site 3 - too remote from settlement
- Site 1 - northern half - visually prominent
- Site 7 - too visually prominent and difficult to contain once development allowed
- Sites 8, 9 and 12 - too remote from settlement and difficult to service
- Site 16 - land locked and would have detrimental effect on neighbouring properties and conservation area
- Sites 5 and 15 (the recreation ground and the allotments) - vital to be kept for the community as they are real assets and well located to service the community.
- Site 13 (Village Hall field) -- vital to be kept for the community as they are real assets and well located to service the community.

Possible Sites – i.e. those considered to have some development potential and worthy of further consideration:

(N.B. Foxley Tagg still need to analyse the land owned by the Shipsey family)

- Site 1 - the L shaped parcel of land fronting onto Sopworth Lane could be one of the options to be given further consideration—considered to be well located to meet some future development needs. Could be suitable for mix of uses including a new doctors' surgery, pre-school facility, school expansion, and some housing.
- Frontage of site 6 - might have potential for limited amount of frontage development – but not the entire site. Land to rear could be used for additional sports field, allotment, or community orchard – which could help limit future development.
- Site 4 - could be considered as an alternative development option. Good site as near school and not all of it would have to be used for housing. New sport field could be moved to rear of site 6 - this would help limit future development. This option would be likely to present the village with most benefit to the entire community – more particularly it could help deliver the desired new sports facilities. (Foxley Tagg thinks the village is lacking a decent sporting provisions and decent size surgery).
- Site 11 - is an existing allocated housing site which could be retained in the plan
- Site 10 - Vicarage site – which is well located and has clear development potential.

In addition to the above, there are a number of individual potential building plots in the village that could come forward for development but these are too small for consideration in the NHP. These would be treated as windfall sites in due course through the normal planning process. If they lie within the defined settlement boundary they will be considered in normal way by WC.

Regarding the future of Anthony Close, Green Square's asset team are currently in the process of re-evaluating all of its sites. JC confirmed that at the moment Anthony Close is not up for consideration and off limits but Green Square will talk

to WC in the future about provision and need. ST suggested to JC that it might be a question to think about if Green Square were to consolidate with the other properties/stock under its control and the emerging future development options .

127 Further sites - After discussion it was agreed that there should be a deadline for any new sites for development consideration. The land has to be big enough for 4 or more houses. It was agreed that a final call for sites would be publicised in the Cliffhanger.

128 The plan

JT suggested that there was a need to balance how much development is being considered in this plan i.e. how many houses and sites that you have to think about "now" - whilst leaving other sites for future generations and discussion on future plans after 2026.

JC was keen for the village not to lose sight of what the village wants outside of houses, e.g. community orchards, transport, looking at plans as an overall concept. ST stated the linkage with the community is more important than the issue of housing.

The question was asked will the site options and benefits be explained to the public and what guarantee will be given that the community will get these promised benefits. ST stated all the options will be explained and put to the public as it's their plan, their decisions. Any planning application will still have to follow process, i.e. Section 106 and other negotiations which all have various safeguards. JM asked ST if there is a danger of big developers coming in and doing what they want to which ST replied the purpose of the NHP is to offer protection and the question is how to harness it and make it work for community.

Time Scale

The NHP can't be adopted until core strategy has been adopted. The plan won't be put up for submission until April 2015 and hopefully the Core Strategy would be adopted by then. ST stated the village needed to make sure it didn't stray from the time scale. HS asked how much detail will be given at the options level, i.e. how much traffic would be increased if sites were developed. If the community decided that it needed to know that answer then it is up to community to take that further.

129 Update from Steering Group Members

None

130 Future Actions

All happy with timescale given by FT. It was decided the information workshop will be on the 29th May which is the same as the Annual Parish Meeting (APM) which starts at 7.30pm. The workshop is mainly for information giving than decision making, so everyone is made aware of the concept and what the NHP is about. The 16th June was decided as the deadline for land to be considered for development for 4 or more houses.

ACTION - JM and MJ to write to Cliffhanger information about the 16th June and look at advertising the event on 29th May

ACTION – FT to analyse Shipsey land and report at the next meeting

131 AOB and Questions

JM asked ST her views on how the steering group was getting on so far. ST reiterated the importance of sticking to the time scale.

132 To confirm date for next meeting

The next meeting will be on the 29th May and on the 17th June.

The meeting closed at 9.15pm. Notes were taken by Sarah Wood, Admin Support to the Steering Group.