

Sherston Neighbourhood Plan (NP) Review Working Party

Here are the notes of the meeting of the working group, held on 3rd March 2026, online at 7.30pm:

Present:

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

Apologies:

- Jane Hirst (JH)
- Tanya Burgess (TB)

Previous Minutes:

Approved

Matters Arising:

Contained within the meeting notes.

The Meeting:

The meeting was opened with a welcome.

The key issue for the meeting was the negative decision on the Wiltshire Plan and its implications for the NP; a response is planned but the current County Plan is withdrawn.

This leaves the NP with no confirmed housing requirement from Wiltshire. The NP can evidence its own requirement or ask the County for an indicative number. The current status of the County Plan means it may be a 9-month delay otherwise and leaves our plan up in the air.

We still need a plan, keep it in line with current draft MPPF. Firstly, ask Wiltshire for a target but alongside consider coming up with our own. To do this use demographics, identify under occupied homes and land available. This to be community led and with a potential to increase the requirement, keeping to only a limited number of sites (**Aaron has a comparable area report he can send**). Further highlighting other social factors as a commitment to keep the school going.

So:

- Harness the previous work done on Sherston
- Realign what done, in tandem with Wilts and own
- Agree what's robust enough to use

- Still ask Wilts first
- If no answer, then our own and tested
- Recognise without Wilts targets there is greater need to have the community onboard
- Consider 30 + 80% =50. Recognising the spatial policy for Wilts and the urban vs protected National Landscapes. Need to hear from National landscapes and their Cotswold board. Numbers could go down.
- To achieve a number a Wilts requirement is preferred or harness the consultants to give advice to meet our need and requirement of how we meet than need in line with constraints; this may mean figures do not reduce.
- There may be more work, as under current situation if sites are identified it's difficult for the council to refuse applications which may go beyond numbers we want on a site, though we must use the National Landscape as defence; hoping this offers enough defence.
- We do not want to waste work done or community voice we have to influence the plan. The current plan has defended us e.g. with Sopworth Lane and The Elms are happening. Only the vicarage site outstanding. Smaller schemes can be considered case by case.
- Sherston has limited opportunities, recognising the historic issues and flood plain.
- It is hard to commit in such a time of change. If the NP review is completed and then Wiltshire's, it may not directly complement but then we can just re-review the plan. Have a plan pre-Wilts but flexible enough to encompass Wilts and national changes, assuring the protection of limited building on sites.
- Increases in numbers can be challenged by evidencing harm to the village landscape and dismiss sites to reduce speculative applications.

Thus:

- **Martin will ask Mike Kilminster at Wiltshire re targets**
- This not to delay our own planning
- **Confirm this with Parish Council**

Report back on activities

- Henrietta offered thanks for the feedback on the documents
- There is not yet policy recommendations available
- Landowner discussions are outstanding. E.g. Sandpits Lane. An agent for the Tetbury road site 2 has requested a discussion with the Parish Council
- Vicarage site- requirements for more burial ground discussions in hand
- Catherine and Mike to attend meetings with Martin. This to help with opportunities and getting the developments we need. e.g. access for site 4 pending the highways access to be discussed with Wiltshire Highways and developers.
- To harness an active travel policy, transport, footpaths, parking pressures.
- Connectivity increased with CIL funds e.g. footpaths and crossing points
- Brook Hill dangerous for pedestrians, no footpath, could this be CIL Funded. Lower Court Street similar.
- Factor in direct routes
- Highspeed broadband policy to remain

- Henrietta has updated the November 2024 document with all the comments and thanked those who contributed.
- Need recognised to be more specific / local in policy applications
- Considered how far do we determine how we can increase numbers on developments
- Looked at Sandpits Lane as e.g. Points are bullet pointed from feedback and issues as landscaping, reducing larger houses and best green spaces, restating county and national policy areas, with local nuances e.g. on how the landscaping is created, footpaths, vehicle access (low speed) as it hits Sandpits Lane and any links/ benefits to sports need e.g. skating
- Keeping the community involved is crucial e.g. Northend Gardens, make it more attractive for all and reduce any fears,
- Developers are on the way with ecology etc reports, and we need to see these assessments to help us e.g. understand the impact
- Asking developers how they arrived at their current context is crucial- if it's in the NP it will help as we can influence/ lay down the rules and what the community has voiced
- Can the football club extend here? Their need for another pitch identified already but Sandpits Lane is too small, rather needs to be north of the current site
- Can each current site contribute to these community needs? Wiltshire have information on this and CIL monies area an opportunity here.
- Looking at the Tetbury road site. Same planning per hectare or paired/ individual unit access but lose trees and hedgerows. 6 dwellings but could this increase? With access to the north, ensuring the footpath and right of way to the neighbouring field
- Community gains for narrowness of road, rutted, potholes needed on back of this. Need to be visible access and safe for pedestrians (currently not)
- Currently DO NOT show speculators our plans,
- Vicarage development 2-3 houses (with a new vicarage). It's a conservation area so with a covenant this may not be possible. **Kath to ask Area Dean.** Already working on extension of churchyard, looking at past 10-year needs and protecting 10 and 20 years ahead for burials and ashes plots. So, houses and churchyard, both or one to be confirmed as staying in the NP review.

Going forward

Inline with also actions cited above

- Ask Cotswold National Landscape's planning officer to visit and walk around and offer their input on sites in their landscapes
- Maritn will update Aaron on actions
- Henrietta will check the policies vs community questionnaires
- Next meeting in person with consultants and National Landscapes

AOB

N/A

Next Meeting- TBC

Sherston Neighbourhood Plan Review Working Party

DRAFT Agenda for the meeting TBC

1. Apologies
2. Approval of minutes of the 3rd March 2026
3. Matters Arising from the minutes
4. Report back on activities
5. AOB
6. Date of Next Meeting