

# SHERSTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

## STEERING GROUP SUB COMMITTEE

---

### Notes of Meeting held on Wednesday 7th 2016 Pinkney Park at 7.30 pm

#### **Present:**

John Matthews (JM), Mike Johnson (MJ), Sarah Wood (SW), John Knight (JK), Mr Harry Stevens (HS), Graham Morris (GM), Judy Sharp (JS), James Pyle (JP), Graham Hayman (GH), John Thomson (JT)

NP / Plan = Neighbourhood Plan

WC – Wiltshire Council

#### **1. Apologies**

Apologies sent from Saara Sharman

#### **2. Viability Assessment Report Summary**

At the last full steering group meeting the viability assessment report on site 1A/B produced by Seymour Surveyors was discussed. Although the actual document is currently not available for public view, Seymour's produced a basic summary of its findings which was circulated. The report concluded that the project and development of the site is financially viable to provide a new surgery, allocation of land for preschool and any future school expansion with the development of 45 new homes. The assessment showed that only this amount of houses on this site would deliver all the requirements and benefits mentioned above. This would be the proposal of the NP put to the village if the steering group are in agreement.

At the time of the meeting the group were awaiting confirmation from WC that the surgery's construction was deliverable and not just the site, so no decisions could be made at the time regarding the next stage. Since then confirmation has been received from WC that the construction of the surgery will be deliverable and would be made a condition of the land sale not a planning condition.

MJ and JK have produced their own concise summary of the Viability report, which they ran through in detail with the sub-committee.

#### **3. The Surgery –**

JT explained that the planned new surgery would initially be owned by WC and rented to the doctors. Once WC have recouped their investment the intention would be to transfer the building to the parish council and community. HS asked how long it might take for the surgery to be transferred. JT responded that it would probably be 5-10 years before it is handed onto the community. HS also asked what the rental income would be. JT explained that at this point it is difficult to give a precise figure however what can be said is that the village should in due course be receiving a rental income (paid for by the NHS). JS pointed out that if other rooms in the new surgery are utilised it can provide additional income opportunities.

The most important factor is by building a new surgery, leasing it to the doctors safeguards it for the future. A new surgery will help attract new GPs as they will not have to financially buy into the practice as the building is being leased. HS asked what the risk to the village is once the surgery is built and for whatever reason the practice collapses. JT explained that if it happens early on WC will own it and it will be their responsibility and if after the village will own the building. JT went on to say it is very unlikely as he believes that in the near future money will soon start coming back to the rural communities and smaller practices to take strain from acute

hospitals. The bigger threat is doing nothing, if so the village will lose the practice. The community owning the surgery will protect the practice for the future. The landowners are keen to leave legacy for the village.

An article from the Tolsey surgery regarding the current situation is being written by JS and will go into the January Cliffhanger. MJ said that it is important the Surgery stand up and fight for its future. JM mentioned to the group that he knows a retired Doctor and health professional who although doesn't live in the village, is fully supportive of the proposal and would happily act as an independent voice at a public meeting. JM asked the group if it would be happy for her to attend a meeting and speak. They all agreed.

#### **4. Other Benefits of Proposal–**

It was pointed out that if this proposal does go ahead it will also benefit the school by allocating land for a pre-school and any possible future school expansion. The land would be provided but not the funding for the construction of the pre-school. If the proposed development did take place, a substantial contribution would go to education. Also if a NP was in place the community would receive a 25% CIL (community Infrastructure Levy) from the development which could be used towards improving sporting facilities in the parish.

#### **5. Future Actions**

At the next Steering Group meeting on Monday members will be asked if they agree to go public with this proposal and if so to agree to publish an article in the January Cliffhanger together with a short questionnaire survey asking local residents if they support such a proposition. As mentioned in the last meeting MJ has asked Frank Hatt to help compile article. Once the article is in draft form he will send on to JS, JT and HS for feedback prior to publication.

#### **6. AOB**

The realistic goal of getting the proposed plan to referendum (providing it is approved by WC and inspector) is the summer of 2017. It is both a prescriptive and long process however which has to be followed.

#### **7. Date of Next meeting**

The next full steering group is on Monday the 12<sup>th</sup> of December.

Meeting finished at 8.50pm. Notes taken by SW.