

**Oaklands School Site and The Glebelands Steering Group**  
**8<sup>th</sup> December 2014**

		Actions
<b>1</b>	<p><b>Present:</b></p> <p>Chris Edwards, Chair, Shropshire Council (CE)            Cllr Ted Clarke, Shropshire Council and Parish Council (TC)            David Fairclough, Community Action Officer, Shropshire Council (DF)            Jane Kenyon, Asset Management Officer, Shropshire Council (JK)            Jenny Crowder, Premises Manager, Learning &amp; Skills, Shropshire Council (JC)            Michael Watney, Balfours (MW)            James Drew, Prospects commissioned building surveyor (JD)            Tim Lomax, Vicar of Christchurch (TL)            Fiona Craig, York House (FC)            Andy Goldsmith, Scout and Guide Association (AG)            Jack Parry, Christ Church rep (JP)            Joanne Hughes, note taker, Shropshire Council (JH)</p> <p>Apologies: Rawden Parslow</p>	
<b>2.</b>	<p><b>Update from Chair</b></p> <p>CKE and TC have recently briefed Portfolio Holder members Cllrs Mal Price and Ann Hartley on the Steering Group's work to date and they are fully supportive of the process. Cllr Price to be invited to future meetings.</p>	<p>JH to invite Mal Price</p>
<b>3.</b>	<p><b>Update on consultation responses</b></p> <p>The consultation has now closed and DF is collating the community responses and provided a verbal update to the group. The drop in session that was held following the LJC meeting was well attended and just under 100 comments have been received, along with many informal conversations.</p> <p>The majority view of residents is that they want to retain as much green space in the development as possible. It is widely accepted that the development is a good opportunity for Bayston Hill and more detail is now required. Most people also consider it a positive opportunity to have a purpose built, new library and a community building.</p> <p>Several Lyth Hill residents whose gardens back on to the Glebelands, would like to see a wider buffer zone so they are not overlooked by the new houses. There is already an established tree line and some concerns were raised about damaging tree roots during the development. A wider buffer zone may encroach on the sewer line and creating a wider green strip would be difficult to maintain and may encourage anti-social behaviour. It should also be noted that the new</p>	

	<p>properties should not be overshadowed by the tree line.</p> <p>Residents of Eric Lock Road West also wish to retain a wide buffer zone at the end of their gardens and would like the option of an access road off Eric Lock Road West to be removed from the proposals altogether.</p> <p>AG commented that it would be useful to determine what the green space is needed for and this would help in deciding the size and/or position.</p> <p>Residents of Glebe Road are concerned about the glare from headlights when cars leave the car park. It should also be noted that this could be an issue arising from the access road, but consideration will be given to mitigate this with Highways colleagues at a later stage.</p> <p>Tree preservation orders (TPO's) have been requested on all the trees shown on the site that are currently Category 1 &amp; 2. Some concerns have been noted about an increase in local traffic, but this may not be noticed as the site was previously a school and therefore the traffic movements will not occur at regular times as before.</p> <p>It was agreed that some of the questions raised by residents, cannot be answered yet e.g. capacity of sewers, number and mix of houses, size of play area.</p> <p>In summary, there are no show stoppers from the consultation. Following collation, it was agreed that DF would produce a short paper summarising comments and how they have been included as far as practicable in the development brief that this group is producing. This will help with communications and to show that residents' comments have been rationalised and explained in the brief.</p>	<p>DF to collate and draft paper</p>
4.	<p><b>Discussions</b></p>	
	<p>JK noted that a timeline would now be useful. The signing off of the development brief does not have to go to Cabinet, but can be done by the relevant Portfolio Holder. We could now move to producing an indicative plan within the next month. JK to progress.</p> <p>The size and mix of housing was discussed and whether there is a desire for bungalows in Bayston Hill. A demand is not recognised specifically as they tend to remain on the market for a while, but homes for elderly residents to downsize to would be beneficial. Fewer bungalows can be built than houses due to floorspace required and it should be remembered that all parties in the land sale are looking to maximise their profits, while also giving consideration to the needs of the community. We need to be transparent in our proposals and therefore</p>	<p>JK to draft</p>

	<p>financial negotiations will be critical in finalising the plans.</p> <p>Also key in finalising the plans will be to confirm York House and the Scout and Guide Association requirements. There is a site meeting at York House following this meeting where options will be discussed.</p> <p>Also linked in with putting more detail into the plans, are the aspirations of the community hub with the library and Parish Council as principal tenants and how much this will cost. The Scouts and Guides Association have agreed in principle to a relocation, but again need to know the value of the existing land sale so they know what can be spent on a new build. It was suggested that the Parish Council are asked to formally minute their agreement and TC agreed to take this to the next meeting.</p> <p>It was suggested and agreed that 2 quotes should be requested with different mixes of housing (optimum and minimum) when the time comes to get indicative costings.</p> <p>CKE agreed to speak to Steve Law in Property Services and Rawden Parslow in Libraries to plan out what the community hub and car park requirements could be and draw up specifications.</p>	<p>TC</p> <p>CKE</p>
5.	<p><b>Any other business</b></p>	
	<p>TL advised that the sale of land at Cross Lane is progressing as advised in previous minutes, but he is waiting to hear from our Legal department if the sale proceeds can be given to the Scouts or Oakmeadow School. JK will follow up.</p> <p>JC advised that the Secretary of State approval that is required to enable the Local Authority to sell the old school site, is to be put into one application along with 3 other sites in Shawbury, Maesbury and St Martin's. JC will progress and apply as soon as possible.</p> <p>The local newsletter 'The Villager' is not published again until February 2015, so DF was asked to draft a summary of the comments and a timeline of next steps for publication.</p> <p>TC reminded the group that due to the late inclusion of the Glebeland in the development, the community raising the issue about losing green, open space which would not have been a consideration if just the school site was put up for sale. This has meant that a certain proportion of the profits available to the Local Authority will be eroded due to now having to provide open space within the development brief.</p>	<p>JK</p> <p>JC</p> <p>DF</p>
6.	<p><b>Dates of 2015 meetings</b></p>	

*All at Shirehall:*

23 January at 10am – 11.30am, Meeting Room 1, West Wing

27 February at 1.30pm – 3pm, Oswestry Room

26 March at 10am – 11.30am, Oswestry Room

23 April at 10am – 11.30am, Wenlock Room

21 May at 2pm – 3.30pm, Oswestry Room

25 June at 10am – 11.30am, Wilfred Owen Room

23 July at 10am – 11.30am, Oswestry Room