

Oaklands School Site and The Glebelands Steering Group
23rd April 2015

| | | Actions |
|-----------|---|---------|
| 1 | <p>Present:</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) Helen Lambert, Learning & Skills Premises, Shropshire Council (HL) Michael Watney, Balfours (MW) Jack Parry, Christ Church rep (JP) Jeremy Ward, Walker Troup Architects (JW) Tim Lomax, Christchurch Vicar (TL) Fiona Craig, York House Manager, Prospects (FC) James Drew, Drew Surveyors for Prospects (JD) Cllr Mal Price, Portfolio Holder for Planning, Shropshire Council (MP) Mark Salt, Estates, Shropshire Council (MS) Andy Mason, Lichfield Diocese (AM) Rawden Parslow, Library Manager, Shropshire Council (RP) Emma Kay, Bayston Hill Parish Council (EK) Joanne Hughes, note taker, Shropshire Council (JH)</p> <p>Apologies: Andy Goldsmith</p> | |
| 2. | <p>Actions from 26th March meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The only action was for JW to work up a more detailed drawing of Option 2 and design a further Option 3 which is presented today. | |
| 3. | <p>Indicative site layout</p> <p>JW attended to present 3 options of site layout.</p> <p>Refreshed Option 1 has extra car parking spaces and more for York House and overspill by church, now exceeding 40 spaces.</p> <p>The refreshed Option 2 layout includes additional parking spaces as above and maintains the minimum 17% public open space (POS) as promised in consultation with residents. It also has slightly less dense housing with dwellings single sided on a road and the need to divert the sewer at a cost.</p> <p>Option 3 has a more centralised POS with connecting footpaths. It has better block housing and maintains privacy for York House. The scout hut is included as a stand alone unit (in case new build not achievable), or the area could be</p> | |

| | | |
|-----------|--|----|
| | <p>used for supported housing as approx. 14 one bed units.</p> <p>JW also presented basic plans for a community hub/library/parish office layout and a new vicarage that were shared with the group. Paper copies were circulated.</p> <p>Discussions followed and are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where will cost of community hub come from? • Would like to offer more than the minimum 17% POS if possible • Maximise profit for all parties but some compromise needed • Shropshire Council will need to do a capital appraisal as financial rules mean there cannot be a direct transfer of finances from sale to new build • Concerns raised re the marketing of the site for sale as the market has slowed down considerably recently • Smaller housing most needed in Bayston Hill for young people and downsizing for the older generation • There is a need to be realistic regarding impact on the community versus profit <p>Option 2 is still preferable at this stage.</p> | |
| 4. | Land ownership, site values/financials | |
| | <p>CKE stated that there is now some work to do on identifying the size of each plot for each organisation and starting the financial negotiations. If land values are reduced, who would take the hit financially is a consideration.</p> <p>JP is concerned that only providing the minimum percentage of POS is risky and could damage the credibility of all parties for a long time. The parcel of land owned by the Diocese at Yew Tree Drive is still available for using as POS and remains in the development brief. MP agreed that it is better to address the concerns of a minority of opponents fully, rather than accept a majority consensus.</p> <p>MS advised that there are two ways of delivering the project. Either in partnership with a developer or simply putting the site on the market. The steering group need to decide which option is preferred to aid detailed financial negotiations.</p> <p>MS advised that a financial appraisal will have to be undertaken on the community hub by SC with the library relocation project. RP happy with the draft plan as presented today, dependent on the costs. It was agreed that the orientation of the hub would be better if facing the play area, rather than the road.</p> | JW |

| | | |
|----|---|----------|
| | Costings for the hub need to be estimated by a Quantity Surveyor – MW to provide contacts to JK. | MW |
| 5. | York House proposal update | |
| | <p>CKE and JD had met on site since the last meeting to view the outside area at York House that was discussed for offering up for sale into the development. Prospects view is that the area is not sufficiently valuable to make it a worthwhile deal.</p> <p>Following discussions with York House, JD determined that they are still keen to offer up the whole site into the development and relocate into new, purpose built properties, either within the development or elsewhere in Shropshire. A move would have to be self-financing, i.e. the sale would pay for the new buildings.</p> <p>Their backstop position is to remain in situ and would need dedicated car parking and emergency access at all times.</p> <p>JD would evaluate the site and is happy to consider any other ideas from the group. JW to work up an Option 2A incorporating the York House area for the next meeting.</p> | JD JW |
| 6. | Planning brief update | |
| | There have a couple of minor amendments made to the planning brief, but it now needs a concluding paragraph indicating which option is preferred by the steering group and it can then be adopted. | JK |
| 7. | Community update | |
| | <p>DF welcomed back Emma Kay, Bayston Hill Parish Clerk to the group. DF advised that there is a small group of local opponents to the development that have researched the National Planning Policy Framework and Shropshire Council's planning strategy and is querying the legal status of the Glebelands as a playing field and whether a planning application would be valid. They have sent an open letter to various councillors, officers of this group, the village newsletter and parish council and require a formal response.</p> <p>As the opposition is mainly regarding the loss of the Glebelands which is owned by Lichfield Diocese, MW has provided draft replies which DF and JK will review with planning colleagues and then amend/share with this group before responding formally on behalf of the Steering Group.</p> | DF/JK |
| 8. | Library update | |
| | RP advised that the library savings identified by Shropshire Council still have to | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>be realised, but happy to await the outcome of this process. If necessary, a short term reduction in opening hours may have to be implemented. DF and RP are waiting until after the General Election on the 7th May to start approaching local groups or organisations to take on the running and management of the library in the future.</p> | |
| | <p>Any other business</p> | |
| | <p><i>Actions confirmed:</i></p> <p>JW to draw up Option 2A of the plans to present next time JW to change orientation of the community hub on the plans Quantity Surveyor to be employed to design community hub and provide approx. cost Diocese and SC to start financial negotiations</p> | |
| | <p>Date of next meetings</p> | |
| | <p><i>All at Shirehall:</i></p> <p>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</p> | |