SHERSTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP

Notes of meeting held Tuesday 23rd September 2013
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 G Morris (GM)	Sherston Parish Council
Mr M Johnson (MJ)	Sherston Old School Committee
Mr J Knight (JK)	Sherston Allotments
Mr C Minors (CM)	Wiltshire Council
Mr A Price (AP)	Sherston Youth
Mr C Minors (CM)	Wiltshire Council

7 members of the public were at the meeting. Definitions: "NHP" means Neighbourhood Plan

Item

95. Apologies for absence:
Mr John Thomson, Mr Steve Harvey, Mr Kevin Smith, Mrs Helen Quirke , Mr Mike Llewellen Palmer and Mrs Jo Curson all sent their apologies

96. Approval of notes from last meeting
Minutes were approved and will now be put on the website.

97. Correspondence
97.1 Charles Church
The development company Charles Church have written to the Parish Council seeking to discuss potential opportunities within the parish. In its letter they suggest the sports field as a potential site. SW will acknowledge the letter and let them know that the Parish Council will contact them in the future when the Neighbourhood Plan is further developed.

97.2 Mrs Shipsey
Mrs Shipsey has written to John Matthews regarding the number of houses mentioned in the NHP workshop reported in the Cliff-hanger. She was surprised that each group who attended the workshop would consider developments of up to 80 dwellings. Mrs Shipsey had attended a previous NHP workshop and believed that any development would be on a much smaller scale. She also believed that the Housing Needs survey results contradicted the figure of 80 new homes (mentioned in the workshop) as the majority of the people who replied to the survey put down 10 new dwellings. 318 people replied to that survey and only 40 people attended the NHP workshop. She hoped the NHP committee will put a far higher emphasis on the results of the survey than the views expressed at the meetings. Another member of the public also expressed concern.MR mentioned that the Housing Needs survey covered the need for social/affordable housing, not private or part ownership. Mrs Shipsey disagreed that it was only social housing mentioned in the survey.

CM explained that a Parish Plan allows the community to put the destiny of their village in the hands of community. MJ informed the group that the ideas came out of the workshop and they are just ideas and balance needed to be found.

98. Kathryn Woolf – Toolkit for engaging with a maximum number of parish residents include detailed site discussions.
Kathryn Woolf and Susheel Rao from Good Homes Alliance gave a quick introduction to Voice Back, what it is trying to achieve and how it can support Sherston's Neighbourhood Plan. Kathryn started by asking the group what they loved most about Sherston and asked other questions to help form a feel for the village. This is called a Community Snapshot. The group were then asked a number of questions regarding what things are important for future housing and how they are rated in importance; for example 'how important is design quality' or 'should density be important?' The questions enable the community to think about what they would like out of any new developments and although some questions may seem

obvious, it is vital that wishes needs are expressed at the early stages of negotiating with developers. This exercise was called Community Conversations and the next stage would be to take the findings, list them and discuss importance.
The results of the questions will be collated by Kathryn. It was the first time a Community Toolkit has been tested and Kathryn asked the group for feedback. The general feedback from the group was that there were too many questions, but all agreed that the most important question to start with was 'what do you like in your community?'
Discussion then took place regarding the time of consultations that are still needed. An issue with holding workshops was that the same people were attending them. Therefore, the days, times and venues needed to be changed to engage with as many people as possible.

99. Update on the analysis of potential sites

16 sites have been identified as potential sites for development. The land put forward is owned by Wiltshire Council, the Diocese, the Parish Council and landowners who have come forward with an interest in selling their land for possible development. In June, a sub group was formed to visit each site and analyse the suitability of each one and a report compiled for discussion just highlighting what each site could offer. After discussion amongst the group the following was agreed.

Site Ref

1. **1.A. West of new school –** Logical extension to village. Lower part of field reasonably well screened. At least two potential points of access. Possible site for new surgery, pre-school, sports facilities and/or limited housing.
   1.B West of Knockdown Road – Prominent site when viewed from distance. Access reliant on adjoining land. Whilst cannot be entirely ruled out – not ideal for development during current plan period.
2. **West of site 1 (off Sopworth Lane) –** Prominent site. High impact if developed. Not preferred.
3. **West of Sports Field –** Site well screened. Low impact. Possibility if Site 4 is developed. Suitable for recreational use. Buffer zone.
4. **Sports Field off Knockdown Road –** Low visual impact. Well screened. Access off Knockdown Road. Reasonably well related to existing built form. Funds from the sale of this site would provide funding for new sports field with improved facilities. Good position and not too far out of the village.
5. **Allotment Site** – Although in good location especially for surgery, potentially highly contentious site. Not favoured.
6. **Land North of Sandpits Lane** – would be suitable for replacement sports facilities. Not considered suitable for large scale built development.
7. **Land between Sandpits Lane and Tetbury Lane –** Large site. Open land. Prominent in landscape. Limited access options. Lack of drainage. Distant from village centre. Not favoured with exception of possible single plot within dogleg at southern end of site if access achievable).
8. **Land West of Tetbury Lane –** High impact. Lack of drainage. Distant from centre of village. Poor access. Not favoured.
9. **Land off Tetbury Lane –** Distant from centre of village. Lack of drainage**.** Ecological issues? Small area at southern end of plot considered worthy of further consideration given relationship to existing built form but necessary first to bottom out drainage issue.
10. **Vicarage site off Green Lane –** brown field site considered very logical for small scale development. New vicarage plus burial ground plus limited enabling development.
11. **Junction Green Lane and Sandpits Lane -** Brown field site situated within development limits. Not to be designated for the NHP but considered to have obvious longer term development potential.
12. **Land North of Hunters Field –** Poor access and lacking foul water drainage. Difficult to develop in isolation. Not favoured.
13. **The Village Hall Field –** Important community facility**.** Not considered appropriate or necessary to designate for any other purpose..
14. **Site adjoining kennels off Knockdown Road –** Prominent site lying well outside existing development limits. Distant from village centre. No drainage. Not favoured.
15. **Recreation Ground –** Important community facility situated close to centre of village**.** Very contentious site. Not considered appropriate or necessary to designate for any other purpose.
16. **Land between High Street and Grove Road –** Conservation Area. Potential adverse impact on setting and character of village and listed buildings. Limited or no access. Not favoured.

The following sites were considered worthy of further investigation:

- The Vicarage Site (Site 10 -vicarage/burial space/limited housing development)
- Sandpits Lane Land (Site 6 -replacement playing fields and other sports facilities)
- Sports field (Site 4 - housing development) – possibly including some or all of site 3.
- Land behind School (Site 1A - GP surgery/pre-school facility/school expansion/sports field).
- Corner Green Lane/Sandpits (Site 11 – future housing site).
- Land off Tetbury Lane (Site 9 – short section at southern end – possible site for two or three houses).
- Land between Sandpits/Tetbury Lane (Site 7 – single plot at southern end subject to access constraint).

100. Future Actions

Kathryn to provide questionnaire regarding potential sites; aiming to be in time for the November Cliff-hanger

101. AOB and Questions

A member of the public asked for clarification regarding site 1a and 1b and the time scale of the Parish Plan which will be going to be over 25 years.

RJ mentioned that there was a danger of only talking about development. There is a need to discuss other issues such as electricity, gas and facilities. JM responded by saying that houses will be emotive, but the steering group will have to make sure all other issues are incorporated within the plan as they are vitally important.

102.To confirm date for next meeting

The next meeting will be confirmed.

The meeting closed at 9.30pm. Notes were taken by Sarah Wood, Admin Support to the Steering Group.