

## **Sherston Neighbourhood Plan (NP) Review Working Party**

Here are the notes of the meeting of the working group, held on 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2026 , online at 7.30pm:

### **Present:**

- Martin Smith (MS)
- Mike Johnson (MJ)
- Kath Talboys (KT)
- Catherine Stephens (CS)
- Richard Skeffington (RS)
- Tanya Burgess (TB)
- Henreitta Cole (HC)
- Aaron Smith (AS)

### **Apologies:**

- Jane Hirst (JH)
- Nigel Freeth (NF) (Nigel has now left the group due to COI)

### **Previous Minutes:**

There were no previous minutes to approve

### **Matters Arising:**

N/A

### **The Meeting:**

The focus of this meeting will be the assessments of land and way forward.

The circulated report (Site Selection Topic Paper- Draft/ Confidential) from the consultants was noted, HC noted the amendments had been made from e.g. from Mike and Catherine and Catherine's most recent comments will be added.

AS offered an overview of the Wiltshire context. Changes to the Wiltshire Local Plan (WLP) are likely to be required following an intervention by the Inspector – including extending the plan period to 2042. Changes to the National Planning Policy Framework may also have an impact. This is currently out to consultation until March. This is likely to be published in June or July. There will be similarities to the current NPPF, including there being protection from most speculative developments where there is a recently made NP.

The required changes to the WLP may result in an increase of house numbers required in Sherston (currently 30) by say up to a further 80% uplift. This may be less for villages like Sherston with use of new settlements in the county.

This can be acknowledged within the NP, highlighting the document complies to the best information at the date completed.

We should probably treat the current target as a minimum. The allocation of more than 30 units would provide future proofing. We would of course be able to review the plan if required. The current plan could however potentially cover the future target. We can't reserve sites.

The NP end date could be extended from 2038 to 2042; we can plan for this in line with the Wilts requirement e.g. by providing for say an additional 20 units or we could review the plan as the situation changes.

We need to progress the NP Review:

- How to best take sites forward, ideally based on an independent view from the consultants.
- Utilise the listening to people and review of sites as shown in 4.4 of the document. We can then review if any are not deliverable.
- Noted that the Sandpits Lane site could go up to 70 units, no wish to overdevelop a site but need to be flexible and agree a range. Consider additional supportive sites such as Tetbury Road and Easton Town, with lower numbers- spread the load?
- Suggested increase of affordable homes opportunities to be considered.
- Recognising an average of 30 dwellings per hectare but consider decreasing the density in the village.
- Be flexible with size of the units. Consider provision of a wide range.
- Consider all in context of the landscapes;
- Consider other issues as e.g. the sewage system capacity, access and traffic generation
- Sandpits Lane assessed as the no 1 site but how many units still TBC. Again, need to be looking at affordability and consider the focus or range e.g. smaller or for older or younger people.
- Housing Association interest may be limited, even national ones, in the current climate with care and repair costs to good standards as we can see in the selling off of units at Anthony Close and unwillingness to buy new units currently on offer on Sopworth Lane.
- Affordability requirement to remain at 40%. Can we influence the size of units provided? Allowing the recycling of stock.
- To take the priority site(s) forward the consultants will undertake further work and prepare a short topic paper based on the report.
- The November 2024 report prepared by MLP covers the range of policies and sites needed.
- Both Vicarage site and Anthony's Close proposals in current NP now dubious; suggested we keep the need for new cemetery land and the church to be approached to clarify situation.
- There may be also windfall opportunities e.g. Palmers Yard. All counts towards number required to be provided.
- The plan will in due course need to be screened by Wilts, who will assess it from an environmental perspective.
- The Sandpits Lane site could meet the 30 unit requirement. More could be spread around the village. MLP to concentrate on the top 4. Noted that Easton Town could for example add 3 units.
- Further work now needed to examine: transport, highways, heritage, conservation, views

*Table 4-4 – Analysis of housing option scores from Step 3 and Step 4 sorted by highest ranked Site Ref*

Site Ref	Site Name	Step 3 score	Step 4 score	Total	Rank	Indicative Capacity	Taken Forward
1	Land east of Tetbury Road	1	1	2	6th	35 – 61	Yes  Not now.  Consider if too far out
2	Paddock on Tetbury Road, north of Fourways	3	5	8	3rd	10 – 18	Yes  Consider Southern part
3	Land north of Easton Town	2	2	4	5th	12 – 21	Yes  Site 2 offers access.  Noting key view 13 as per Key Views Topic Paper

							( add to topic paper 4.5)
							Suggested not now
4	Land to rear of 6 Easton Town	4	6	10	2nd	3 – 6	Yes  Highways to be considered
5	Land at Sandpits Lane	6	5	11	1st	25 – 69	Yes  Suggested meeting with agents to discuss plan
9	Land at Hillberry Lodge	5	3	8	3rd	5 – 9	Yes  Impact of punching through on green corridor & footpath

### Going forward

- Talk to Sandpits Lane developers to clarify their intentions and seek to influence what type and scale of development could ideally be provided based on the community wants.
- ✓ Discuss needs further 2/3 bed, affordable, single, older (as consultation, in the plan) – approach local Estate Agent in advance to help establish need/demand
- ✓ Question re efficient density to be agreed; not too dense but optimised to meet needs. Consultants attend and put forward key points. How did they come up with the mix? Have they contacted affordable providers? Allotments and open spaces still to be set.
- Policy 11, Sports. Parish Council and football club information to consultants.
- CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy), money priorities to Parish Council.

- Action consultants to assist draft policy and direction.
- List of priority infrastructure spending to be made.
- Future meeting to review these and evidence to fill the gaps.
- Need to revisit mix of policies.
- Need a policy on need.
- Before the next meeting to provide MLP feedback/comments on the Review and Monitoring Report November 2024 (re-circulated), sustaining the momentum with the NP.
- The group agreed the definition of key views in line with the definition in paragraph 2.6.
- Further to use the Key Views, Green Spaces and NHHA policies as part of the suite of evidence to prepare new policies.
- No need to notify landowners affected by Green Space proposals at this stage. This can be done at the Regulation 14 stage – at the same time as informing the general public.
- Need to match policies to Wiltshire's emerging Local Plan. 2-3 months allows the gaining of increased evidence with a view to putting these proposals forward to the community in say September.

#### **AOB**

- Decision re the new surgery remains pending
- HC will resend the November 2024 report – with a request that we review its contents before our next meeting.

#### **Next Meeting- 3rd March 7.30, via Zoom**

#### **Sherston Neighbourhood Plan Review Working Party**

#### **DRAFT Agenda for the meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> March 7:30pm via zoom**

1. Apologies
2. Approval of minutes of the meeting 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2026
3. Matters Arising from the minutes
4. Report back on activities
5. AOB
6. Date of Next Meeting