SHERSTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP

Minutes of meeting held on Tues. 21st October 2014 in Sherston Village Hall

Present:
Capt. JMatthews(JM) – Chairman
Mr MJohnson(MJ) – SOSCIC?
Dr PPetit(DrP) – Tolsey Surgery
Mr GHayman(GH) -
Mr GMorris(GM) – Sherston Parish Council
Mr NFreeth(NF) – Sherston Churches
Mr JPyle(JP) –
Mr JKnight(JK - Sherston Allotments

Mrs GClampitt-Dix(GCD) – Wiltshire Council

&

7 no local residents in attendance.

Item 1. Apologies for absence
JM welcomed all present and outlined the intent to discuss the feedback and results from the recently completed NHP Survey. Apologies had been received from Messrs KSmith, APrice, H Stevens, and Mesdames CLiddington, JCurzon

Item 2. Approval of notes from the September meeting and event.
A query from the floor was raised in respect of Plot 5, The Allotments, where its original rating under the Planning Consultants' scoring was high yet it had not been included as an option site. It was advised that the Consultant had not been in a position to consider the history of this site, its strong local support as is and recently agreed terms for continuity, all of which were considered by The Steering Group in their subsequent review to warrant its exclusion.

The minutes were unanimously approved.

Item 3. Correspondence
The items of correspondence received are covered under Item 4.

Item 4. Update.
The developments as hereunder had occurred since the September Meeting:

1. Plot 17 at Easton Town has been withdrawn as a potential development site by its owners.
2. The owners of Plot 3 have advised the PC of their interest in selling this site

3. The owners of Plot 1 have queried the possible exclusion of part of this site, Plot 1B, from the development process. JM explained the logic in scoring the originally proposed sites and advised the major concern expressed by The Steering Group's Planning Consultant, Messrs Foxley Tagg(FT) on this particular site was largely upon landscaping grounds. Also there was a need to balance the areas of suitable land with finally agreed new house numbers. It was accepted however that with the recent removal of Plot 17, as a potential site, the position overall would be subject to further review. JM undertook to follow this through with FT and the Steering Group.

Item 5. Feedback and Results from NHP Surveys.

An analysis of the feedback as a result of the recent questionnaires had been undertaken by MJ and made available in tabular form. Copies of these tables would be reproduced in the next Cliffhanger and posted on the Neighbourhood Plan website. About 100 people had visited the exhibition and about 80 responses had been received (from a total of c1300 eligible voters). MJ advised that the final voting opportunity was still some way off, providing ample opportunity yet for a more significant and appropriate response.

MJ undertook the presentation of the feedback document summaries for information and discussion.

Planning Priorities. All items listed were voted on by Steering Group and unanimously supported. In addition, it was agreed that a number of additional sites deemed worthy of protection that had been identified by respondents would be added to the list (e.g Stretchline; the Earthworks adjoining Manor Farm; Grove Wood etc.).

Site Options.

- Sherston Primary School. Expansion supported. Option to remain.
- New Pre-School facility. Limited support but representative present advised strong interest did exist, recognising the need and timescale within which to manifest this. Option to remain.
- Additional Allotments. A case was presented for better management of existing site to meet future need and overall the general response was split in favour. The Steering Group decided to leave this option open for further review. (N.B. Waiting Lists need to be checked/updated).
- Community Orchard. Very limited support received with Group deciding to terminate interest in this option.
- Relocation of GP Surgery. Surgery has been very active in promoting this idea which had received good general support. The Group agreed to continue to support this option.

New Homes Numbers.

The starting point for this discussion was based around the analysis undertaken by FT combined with Wiltshire Council Planning as to what might comprise an appropriate level of housing that ought perhaps to be catered for in the village. If considered on a simple pro-rata basis – taking into account the Wiltshire Core Strategy figure and making allowances for recent completions and commitments – it was considered that the minimum requirement was in the order of an additional 16 units. GCD mentioned that account would need to be taken of the recent (2012) housing needs survey and pointed out that it was in the hands of the community to decide whether it wanted to make provision for a figure higher than this – as indeed a number of communities had opted to do so as to incorporate an element of future-proofing as well as hopefully securing the future of a range of existing services and facilities.

MJ summarised the response received from the questionnaires. Out of a response from 80 people the following support levels were established:

Nil	Up to 16	16 to 25	25 to 40	40 to 55	55+
1	30	21	16	3	9
1.25%	37.5%	26.25%	20%	3.75%	11.25%

After some discussion it was agreed that the responses received, albeit from an unrepresentative sample, supported levels of new housing above the minimum requirement. A range of options may have to be put to the village offering up a number of different sites (see below) both at "up to 25" level and c.40 level – particularly if there is going to be any serious debate about whether any improved sports facilities can be delivered.

Housing Option Sites

Site 10 received good support. NF advised that The Diocese was actively working up a detailed scheme.

Site 11 was also well supported. MJ pointed out that this was a long-standing existing allocation.

Site 6 and then Site 4, The Football Field were the next most supported.

Site 17 received the least support. (N.B. This site has now been withdrawn from the equation).

Site 1A (Sopworth Lane)

This site has been identified as suitable for mixed use, including for a new GP Surgery, the future expansion of the primary school and possible site for a pre-school facility. The option including the GP surgery was best supported. In addition to meeting The Surgery's spatial needs Wiltshire Council have recently identified the site as suitable for rented Elderly People's accommodation. This is likely to be pursued as a short term option in advance of the NP.

Relocation of Sports Facilities.
JM introduced the benefits that might arise from the allocation of Site 4, The Football Field, for housing. This land, bar an advised access strip for the farmer on adjacent land is owned by Sherston PC and the sale of this for development would generate funds for use in developing planned features as improved sports facilities. Such developments would require acquisition of alternative land for sports use and for which Sites 2 and 6 were considered possibilities. Site 3 was considered to have potential to allow for the future expansion of the existing football field should the Football Field not be redeveloped – but this would necessitate coming to an arrangement with the owner of the intervening access strip.

Item6. Future Actions.
JM recognised that there remained much outstanding to resolve and undertook to follow this through with FT with recognition of the need to get back to "The Village" with a further revised set of options with a view to obtaining a final responses in mid-Dec. This would lead on to the formal Pre- Consultation process with Wiltshire Council.
JM raised the matter of progressing and communicating all outstanding issues with a particular recognition of the need to reach all age groups.
JP volunteered to deliver a solution using Social Media, and this would be in addition to use of Cliff Hanger and public meetings.
The Steering Group to work up some additional options, taking into account all of the views obtained to date and offering up at least two different levels of development for the village to consider (including the Football Field and possibly Site 1B) – explaining the pro's and cons of each – so that a clearer picture of what the village actually wants vcan hopefully be revealed.
JM agreed to meet up with the Agent acting for the owners of Site 1B to discuss matters arising from a letter received from him querying its non-allocation. FT would be asked to undertake a review of Site 1B (as a separate site) and to advise further on its suitability for development.
JM also agreed that it was probably appropriate now to open up discussions with all of the landowners directly affected by some of these emerging proposals.
GCD agreed to ask her highway colleagues to expedite a response to an earlier request for guidance on the suitability of all of the option sites being considered – and to add Sites 1B and 2 to the list.
It was noted that Wiltshire Council had started work on a new Development Plan document comprising a review of the development boundary of all of the settlements in the County – and had written to all Town and Parish Councils seeking their views on this idea. The Parish Council has responded by advising WC that, given the fact that we are in the process of preparing a NP, it would seem logical and far more appropriate for these matters to be dealt with via the NP process. GCD would review these comments and report back in due course.