

Oaklands School Site and The Glebelands Steering Group
21st May 2015

		Actions
1	<p>Present:</p> <p>Chris Edwards, Chair, Shropshire Council (CE) Cllr Ted Clarke, Shropshire Council and Parish Council (TC) Lucy Roberts, Community Action Officer, Shropshire Council (LR) Jane Kenyon, Asset Management Officer, Shropshire Council (JK) Michael Watney, Balfours (MW) Cllr Mal Price, Portfolio Holder for Planning, Shropshire Council (MP) Mark Salt, Estates, Shropshire Council (MS) 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, Fiona Craig, Jeremy Ward, James Drew (Jack Parry and Tim Lomax arrived at end of meeting, MW to brief)</p>	
2.	<p>Actions from 23rd April meeting</p> <p>CE advised that the funds raised from selling the Oaklands site have to go back to Education and cannot be used to fund the building of the community hub. A separate financial appraisal will need to be done for that part of the project.</p> <p>York House proposals are still being considered. JD and FC not in attendance today. Option 3 of the indicative layout, taking York House out of the development will be viewed and discussed later.</p> <p>MW advised that the Bishop of Lichfield has received a similar protest letter from residents. His reply deferred to the joint response that this group is considering and a response has been drafted and will be discussed later.</p>	
3.	<p>Indicative site layout</p> <p>JW had sent copies of Option 3 of an indicative plan as requested, showing the realigned community hub and the space where York House currently stands as part of the development. This space could accommodate up to 6 houses; 2 of which are actually on Diocese land. Therefore the financial gain for York House would be from the profit of 4 new builds which may not be sufficient value for a new, purpose built facility elsewhere.</p> <p>ACTION - CE will send an electronic copy to James Drew once received from MW.</p>	CE

	<p>MS asked whether consideration has been given to refurbishing the existing library and not include within this development which would make it simpler and perhaps more attractive to a developer.</p> <p>MW repeated a concern he has raised before about how we will deliver the proposed scheme in the current financial climate. Too many constraints in the development brief may be off-putting to a developer when there are other simpler sites available. The church facility is spacious and under-utilised so could be considered for community events if a hub was not viable.</p> <p>TC noted that there are strong community feelings that the community hub should not be badged as part of the church. LR agreed that the church could accommodate a café, but the hub should house the library and parish office as originally proposed.</p>	
4.	Land ownership, site values/financials	
	<p>MP stated that we need to know what each land owner wants out of the project and what the profit split will be. MW is happy that negotiations have started with MS of Shropshire Council and that process is ongoing. The Diocese are still committed to assist with the creation of a community hub and the relocation of the scout and guide hut. Infrastructure costs will be discussed as part of the negotiations.</p> <p>The management and responsibility of the public open space, parish office, library etc. need to be agreed and LR offered to start a list of these and indicative costs with input from Ted Clarke, Emma Kay and Rawden Parslow and bring back to the next meeting.</p> <p>The financial prospects for the whole site need to be estimated including car parking, plans, future maintenance, capital appraisal etc to determine if it is a viable scheme.</p> <p>We have building surveyors who could provide estimates for the community hub, but no Quantity Surveyors. It was suggested that we speak to Sue Adams of STAR Housing to ask who they use. MS and MW to continue negotiations. JK to prepare the outline planning applications and request a design and access plan from JW.</p>	<p>LR</p> <p>MS/MW JK</p>
5.	York House proposal update	
	<p>As mentioned at item 3 above, discussions are continuing with York House management company and the current position is unchanged i.e. remain in situ unless the finances stack up to provide a new purpose built facility.</p>	

	<p>On the basis that the financial model for York House does not appear to be viable, it was agreed to note Option 2B as the preferred plan which JK will now incorporate into the planning brief summary and arrange Portfolio Holder authorisation with Cllr Mal Price.</p> <p>CE will email James Drew with the updated drawings.</p>	<p>CE</p> <p>JK</p> <p>CE</p>
6.	Planning brief update	
	JK finalising the brief as above.	JK
7.	Community update	
	<p>An open letter from residents has been sent to the Chair of this steering group and a response has been drafted for consideration. CE is happy for it to be sent out in his name once agreed. JK still to read and add comments.</p> <p>Sharing of the indicative plans with the public was discussed and decided that it would be helpful to hold a “drop-in” session again rather than discuss at a future LJC meeting to avoid overtaking the entire session with one topic.</p> <p>LR and DF will organise once the planning brief has been adopted.</p>	<p>JK</p> <p>LR/DF</p>
8.	Library update	
	Nothing to update, service continues in existing building.	
	Any other business	
	<p><i>Actions confirmed:</i></p> <p>CE to send drawings to James Drew LR to draw up a list of responsibilities and costs MS to contact Sue Adams of Star Housing JK to finalise planning brief, arrange sign off and prepare outline planning application JK to comment on group response and CE to send, DF to publicise/circulate LR/DF to plan drop-in session</p>	
	Date of next meetings	
	<p><i>All at Shirehall:</i></p> <p>25 June at 10am – 10am, Wilfred Owen Room 23 July at 10am – 10am, Oswestry Room</p>	