

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP MEETING

29 November, 2012

Minutes pages 1 - 7

Present:

Phil Applin	Roger Matthews
Tom Baxter	David Morgan
Kevin Bond	Harry Nicolls
David Bowie	Neil Pearce (Planning Consultant)
Carol Cholerton	Kate Rolfe
Elizabeth Dixon	Tim Sanders
Peter Emmerson	Dave Savage
Jenny Fradgley	Sarah Summers (Clerk)
Mark Haselden (Chairman)	Yvonne Wiggins
Trevor Honychurch	Helen Crook

Five members of the public were present.

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting, particularly the members of the public and Yvonne Wiggins who has returned to the Steering Group after a long illness.

1) Apologies

Apologies were received from Andrew Dow, Charles Bates, Ann Hicks, Alan Marks MBE and Moira Tsolakis.

Jenny Fradgley, Kate Rolfe and Dave Savage apologized for having to leave the meeting early.

2) Minutes

The minutes of the Steering Group Meeting held on 25 October were approved as a correct record. A correction was made to the spelling of Kate Rolfe's name, which was recorded incorrectly as Rolf.

3) Chairman's Report

The Chairman provided an extensive verbal report:

3.1 **Shottery:**

- Two implications:
 - i Houses to be built;
 - ii Shottery decision does not agree with housing numbers for district;
- This means SDC does not have a 5 year housing supply;
- SDC looking to challenge in High Court;
- All of this will mean delays to the Core Strategy.

3.2 **Meeting with SDC Chief Executive:**

- Talked of the possibility that the Neighbourhood Plan would go ahead before the Core Strategy;
- There is manpower shortage in SDC planning. Stephanie Chettle is leaving and there is long term sickness within the department;
- Our interests are broadly aligned;
- Paul was reasonably receptive but will need to look into practicalities;
- Will keep reminding him.

3.3 **National Climate:**

- Announcement yesterday that the build proportion of the country will be increased from 9% to 12%;
- In the absence of a Core Strategy, SDC can still rely on existing planning guidance and supplementary planning guidance for another 12 months;
- On appeal, inspectors seem to be coming down in favour of well-funded sustainable developments, which can be put in place fast to kick start the economy;
- The Secretary of State for the Department of Communities and Local Government made a strong hint on 28 November that those local areas with a Neighbourhood Plan in place may receive a larger share of CIL money.

3.4 **Key Questions:**

On the basis of hoping for the best but planning for the worst, the Chairman asked the Steering Group, when going through the

material tonight and in the coming months, they remain focused on four key questions:

- Does the plan protect the character of Stratford?
- If Stratford were to be faced with large scale development, where would it be more acceptable and where would it be less acceptable?
- What would the community want in return from developers and others? How would this be funded?
- Will this Plan help contribute to a vibrant town centre and benefit the local economy?

3.5 **Regeneration:**

A key policy being discussed today is the suggestion that this Plan should support regeneration of the old industrial area for housing and the creation of a new industrial part on the A46. The editorial team needs a mandate from the Steering Group.

3.6 **Timing:**

- By the end of the year the first draft will be completed;
- There will be engagement with developers. We need to understand their perspective and constraints before talking about possible site allocation with any credibility;
- We need to give very careful consideration to sustainability issues. Roger Matthews, will be reviewing content in order to provide and include coverage of sustainability aspects throughout the Plan.
- Phase I consultation with:
 - i. The Town Council and informed groups (Stratford Society, Voice, SDC etc.);
 - ii. General public on specific issues;
- Phase II consultation:
In the spring there will be wider public consultation when we will be consulting on the document itself.

4) Update from Planning Consultant

Neil Pearce tabled his summary of the decision by the Inspectorate on the principle of the Shottery development, interpretation of relevant planning policy, housing land supply and neighbourhood planning. Neil's summary forms part of the minutes and is included as an appendix.

Neil advised that there is strong indication that if SDC continues with housing numbers set at 8,000 dispersed throughout the district their Core Strategy will

be found unsound. SDC will need to reconsider the recommendation of their consultant which proposed a level of at least 11,000 to 12,000 dwellings. Any change to the proposed level of housing will require consultation, which will lead to a further delay in the Core Strategy.

Kevin Bond commented that SDC's housing projections do not meet the government's quote for new jobs in the area. Kevin then queried the Town Council's stance on defending a High Court case if the Plan is challenged by a developer. This issue will be discussed with the Town Council at its Neighbourhood Plan Workshop, as will a review policy.

The likely level of housing and how the different figures would impact on the numbers of dwellings required in the Neighbourhood Plan area gave rise to a lot of speculation. The Chairman requested that Neil looks at various scenarios and comes up with a range of figures for the Neighbourhood Plan area so that we can ascertain the likelihood of the housing numbers if the provision for the District was 11,000 or 12,000 etc. Neil agreed on the proviso that they would be purely speculative.

Neil advised that GLC has confirmed that there is nothing legally to prevent a Neighbourhood Plan going forward for referendum without a Core Strategy in place. We need to proceed in partnership, making sure we are in line with their strategy, so a continued dialogue will be necessary.

It was suggested that any advice from GLC should be received in writing. Neil confirmed that this indeed was the case, and the correspondence from GLC to Mr Pearce forms part of the minutes and is included as an appendix.

5) Further consideration of section II and Consideration of Section III

David Morgan led the Group in an examination of the remaining part of Section II before reviewing Section III. He requested that people consider it further in their own time, and e-mail him with any additional thoughts and suggestions.

David drew attention to a tabled 13 page summary of the Government's paper 'Estimating Housing Need'. He advised that the paper is very helpful and he'd like to include extracts from the document (173 pages long), which need to be identified as evidence for the Plan. He looked for volunteers, requesting that anyone willing to assist with the analysis should contact him direct.

Matters Arising:

- 5.1 Peter Emmerson requested that the Plan specifies vernacular building styles in keeping with the zones of Stratford-upon-Avon;
- 5.2 Kevin Bond expressed concern that the Plan must not make explicit statements about imposing an exclusion on non-residents from moving to care homes in the area (the building of care homes to cater for outsiders), which he considered is a Human Rights issue. Statements can be included which express concern that local facilities are not adequate to cater for an influx on elderly from outside the town – page 33 line 768;
- 5.3 Kevin Bond commented that consideration is being given to relocating the Leisure Centre. Helen Crook confirmed that her group would like the Centre to stay where it is. A ‘central’ location was considered key;
- 5.4 Carol Cholerton requested that the word ‘sustainability’ be included in line 904 on page 39, which should now read ‘.....without damaging the character and biodiversity of the town’;
- 5.5 Members of the public wanted assurance that the Plan would not promote any housing which was not ‘zero emissions compliant’. Although it was agreed that this was an aspiration, this is non enforceable until the law is changed in 2016.

Trevor Honychurch then presented the proposal for the regeneration of the old industrial area at Timothy’s Bridge Road and Masons Road, which Mark had mentioned in his Chairman’s Report as requiring the mandate of the Steering Group.

Trevor suggested that in essence, the proposal was for the brown field sites south of the canal being developed for mixed housing, small shops, and commercial by means of a regeneration master plan. This outcome would have the benefit of:

- i. Housing close to town, Maybird, and railway station, thus minimizing the use of cars;
- ii. Redevelopment and good use of currently empty or under used brown field land;
- iii. A strong defence against house building on the outskirts of the town on green field land;
- iv. Profit being earned by the District Council (and others) which in turn can be ploughed back into the town.

Trevor went on to advise that potentially, part of the Western Road will form a new inner ring road via the cattle market site. Car show rooms, builders merchants, existing light engineering firms etc. would require re-location. A

solution to this could be to utilize farm land north of Bishopton Lane.

Matters Arising:

- 5.6 Peter Emmerson, although acknowledging that specific sites need to be identified, objected to the utilization of farm land north of Bishopton Lane.
- 5.7 Helen Crook, was prepared to support the idea in principle, but would object if green field land was used. The majority of those present, concurred with Helen's objection.
- 5.8 There was general agreement that the green corridor must be preserved;
- 5.9 Carol Cholerton cautioned that there is already some wonderful biodiversity in the existing industrial area, which must also be preserved.

The Chairman proposed, and members AGREED that the proposal be accepted in broad principle, and that a separate working party be instigated to work-up a master plan for the redevelopment and regeneration of the central area and the establishment of an industrial site elsewhere.

6) Public Participation

Concern was raised by one member of the public regarding the planning permission for the Marina. Kevin Bond responded to her enquiry. The resident went on to urge that the Plan puts emphasis on preserving the river area and adjoining countryside.

Other members of the public had participated earlier in the proceedings when zero emissions for housing was discussed.

7) Any Other Business

The Clerk advised that the calendar of meetings for the forthcoming months January to May 2013 will be appended to the minutes.

Sarah went on to advise that following the meeting on 20 December, festive fare will be served, so for that purpose it is important that people let her know if they are unable to attend the meeting.

The Chairman declared the meeting closed at 8:13pm.

Action:

- Neil to provide various scenarios and range of figures on housing numbers;

- A Steering Group member/s is asked to volunteer to help David analyze the 'Estimating Housing Needs' paper;
- Steering Group members to continue examining the three part plan and to contact David with any further amendments, ideas or suggestions;
- Management Group to consider the mandate on redeveloping/relocating the industrial area.

Attached:

- Avon Planning Services summary of the Inspectorate's decision on the Shottery Development
- Extract from Inspectorate's Report
- Correspondence between Avon Planning Services and GLC;
- DCLG paper on 'Estimating Housing Need';
- Industrial area map;
- Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Plan Draft v5;
- Calendar of Meeting for 2013.