

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP MEETING

29 August 2013

Minutes pages 1-5

Present:

Phil Applin	Roger Matthews
Tom Baxter	Harry Nicholls
Carol Cholterton	Neil Pearce – Planning Consultant
Elizabeth Dixon	Richard Rose
Andrew Dow	Dave Savage
Peter Emmerson	John Scampion
Mark Haselden - Chairman	David Stephenson
Martyn Luscombe	Sarah Summers - Clerk

One member of the Public was present

1) Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from David Bowie, Jeff Downes and Jenny Fradgley.

2) Minutes

A query why informal discussions had taken place with Mr Tony Bird regarding the regeneration area received a detailed response from the Chairman and David Stephenson. Subsequently, it was AGREED that the first paragraph on page three would be amended slightly to reflect that discussions had taken place with a number of developers, not just with Mr Bird:

With regard to the Regeneration Area, there had been informal discussions with a number of developers, including Tony Bird, who had all given positive feedback...

A further amendment was requested and AGREED to the penultimate paragraph on page two in order to clarify that the proposed business area would include warehousing and car dealerships, rather than, as it is currently worded, it appears that it is specifically for warehousing and car dealerships:

The proposed business areas which will include warehousing and car dealerships were off the A46 and east of Birmingham Road, north of A46...

Subject to the above amendments, the minutes of the meeting held on 25 July 2013 were approved as a correct record.

3) Chairman's Report

The Chairman reported that if there is to be a new settlement in the district Stratford-upon-Avon's housing allocation could be accommodated by development already in the pipeline together with the proposed Regeneration Area. Mark cautioned that the implications were serious if Gaydon/Lighthorne or another large settlement in the area were not to go ahead, for it could mean that Stratford-upon-Avon would have to accommodate a great many more houses.

The potential of 2,500 more houses in the south-east of Stratford-upon-Avon would fundamentally change the character of the town and subsequently the Neighbourhood Plan itself. Additionally, if Gaydon were to be put on hold, it could present major delays in the timetable for the adoption of the Core Strategy.

The Neighbourhood Plan group has been invited to submit a response to the consultation and it was AGREED that the management team would draft a response in support of a new settlement in the district, as the regeneration area and all the other development in the pipeline means that Stratford-upon-Avon has reached its capacity for housing and any further major housing development would seriously affect the character of the town.

Mark went on to report on the substantial development that is currently proposed for Tiddington – 250 houses at the top of Loxley Road and 50 houses (or 17 bungalows) by the side of the Home Guard Club.

Although Tiddington is within the Neighbourhood Plan Area, it is treated as a village in the Core Strategy and it was felt important that contact is made with residents in Tiddington to try and get a representative onto the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. Elizabeth Dixon agreed to pass on contact details of the editor of the Tiddington Newsletter.

4) Core Strategy

Having touched on this under the Chairman's Report, little further was said apart from reiterating the concern that the new settlement uncertainty could potentially de-rail the whole process.

5) Regeneration

David Stephenson reported that having been approached to provide support during Core Strategy consultations he'd had meetings with Dave Nash and Paul Harris from the District Council. He advised that he had tried to push them to adopt 5 zones to include the north-west end of Masons Road, but

this appears unlikely. There has been no further feedback from SDC regarding participation in these consultation events.

The questionnaire statistics are being shared with the District Council and currently Simon Purfield is working on categorizing the comments. Hopefully this will be completed in the next week or so.

David reported that he was currently creating a template itemizing the planned policies with the ratio of those who agreed or disagreed with the proposal. The team will then be able to make a judgment on what we should do about them. He stressed that this is definitely work in progress and at present, only represents his interpretation. It is therefore not open to general release but can be found in the NP dropbox.

The work also includes an analysis of NP -v- CS policies and David advised that under housing, the biggest objection was the ratio for affordable homes, but as this forms part of the Core Strategy, it is difficult to see where we would go with this policy. It was also very evident that there is a need and a shortage of bungalows, which gave rise to a debate and consideration of whether to incorporate in the Plan a requirement for a percentage of bungalows just like there is a requirement for a percentage of affordable homes in the Core Strategy.

The debate developed into a discussion on the profit in land value uplift and Mark suggested that expert advice should be sought to work through whether it is possible to improve the quality and appropriateness of a development by subsidizing that from the land price.

6) Town Centre

John Scampion advised that there must be consistency between our proposals and those at SDC. Currently, it 'fits only where it touches' and is a little oblique. We must work on filling this out to ensure there is no room for an ambushing of Town Centre provision in the plan. Consequently, meetings have been arranged with SDC to try and explore these consistencies:

Town Square)	
Pedestrianisation/Traffic)	All touched on in the Core Strategy
Good Design)	

John went on to explain that these all present quite a fertile ground for controversy and disagreement and before attending the first of a series of meetings with SDC on 23 September, a meeting of the management team is necessary to ensure that any discussions with SDC are representative of the views of the Neighbourhood Plan group.

Elizabeth Dixon asked if she could take part in these discussions, having a particular interest and knowledge in pedestrianisation/traffic.

7) Future Governance Arrangements

Mark advised that once the group has finalized and written the Plan, it would then become the responsibility of the Town Council to take it forward through to referendum.

It was suggested that under the umbrella of the Town Council's Planning Committee, a sub-committee should be instigated which should incorporate not just Town Council members but should include representation from the NP group and local organisations in order for the Plan to make its way to referendum. Long term, it would also provide the platform to ensure that in the future, the NP is complied with, and as years go by, updated.

It is too early to determine the make-up of the proposed committee, which would have to go to Town Council for agreement, but concern was voiced when it was suggested that the make-up should be politically balanced as this appeared to imply that future governance would be political. The Chairman advised that the proposed political balance was suggested in order to achieve quite the contrary, and confirmed that the make-up and constitution of the new group would be carefully considered and consulted upon.

8) Update from the Planning Consultant

Neil Pearce reported that the Government's sixth edition of the Neighbourhood Plan Newsletter was published on 28 August and there is a link in the newsletter to an on-line web tool which gives guidance on Neighbourhood Planning. The newsletter is circulated with the minutes.

He went on to give some national statistics on Neighbourhood Plans and advised that the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors has introduced a Neighbourhood Plan Independent Examiners Referring Service, which effectively has been set up to train the examiners.

9) Public Participation

Mr Eric Brookes attended the meeting, and contributed during proceedings. During Public Participation he gave a brief introduction about himself and his interest in infrastructure. He has undertaken voluntary surveys in the past which had been welcomed by SDC and WCC. Mr Brookes stated that if the Neighbourhood Plan team required his expertise, he would be happy to help

but his advice would be ‘think big, think bold and be brave’. The Chairman advised that he would pass this on to the infrastructure working group.

10) Any Other Business

There was no other business.

The Chairman declared the meeting closed at 8:00pm