

**Oaklands School Site and The Glebelands Steering Group  
14<sup>th</sup> September 2017**

	Actions
<p><b>1. Present:</b></p> <p>Chris Edwards - Chair, Shropshire Council (CE)            Cllr Ted Clarke - Shropshire Council and Parish Council (TC)            Michael Watney, Balfours, agent for Lichfield Diocese (MW)            Lucy Roberts – Community Enablement Officer, Shropshire Council (LR)            Jack Parry, Christchurch rep (JP)            Jane Kenyon, Senior Property Officer, Shropshire Council (JK)            Donna Payne, Capital Finance Officer, Shropshire Council (DP)            Caroline Higgins, Bayston Hill Parish Clerk (CH)            Rawden Parslow, Library Service Manager, Shropshire Council (RP)            Joanne Hughes - note taker, Shropshire Council (JH)</p> <p>Apologies: Andy Goldsmith</p>	
<p><b>2.</b> Opportune to meet today after the community drop in session yesterday. Three items on agenda to discuss.</p> <p>Drop in feedback            Cabinet report            General updates</p> <p><i>COMMUNITY CONSULTATION FEEDBACK</i></p> <p>LR – community consultation event held in Bayston Hill yesterday was a team effort which went very well. The team saw over 100 people, a constant stream of visitors all day until 8pm. People who lived near development site, raised various questions e.g. buffer zone by Eric Lock Rd houses, is the route by church still available etc. LR to type up feedback notes.</p> <p>There were some disgruntled residents, asking whether there will be compensation for any loss of house value; can they have first choice of new builds. All comments/questions as expected, there appeared to be no surprises for residents and most were happy to see some movement regarding the site, Most conversations were talking people through the plans and explanations of the drawings.</p> <p>Church car parking question – 52 spaces currently available, but new provision only shows 47. <b>ACTION</b> - JP to speak to resident, spaces are not marked out so difficult to quantify. The neighbour who lives next to the existing library asked about the building of new houses on the old library site.</p> <p>RP had positive discussions regarding the community hub. He assured people that the Scouts will not be left without relocation options, there is support from both the Parish Council and Shropshire Council. The Library will maintain square</p>	<p><b>JP</b></p>

footage in the new hub.

TC – Lucy and Jane were tremendous at yesterday’s event, thank you. Constant stream of visitors from 2pm to 8pm. Many questions about when the development will be built.

LR explained the process of the Cabinet report, planning permission etc. She took email addresses to advise interested parties when the planning portal goes live. She also explained about outline permission and reserved matters.

JK – the event worked better than a public meeting, with face to face conversations.

TC – issues flagged, many people were anxious about the proportion of retirement accommodation to be included in the development. There is a demand in Bayston Hill. Old ditch at back of Glebelands in the buffer zone, query about who owns it. This needs to be checked with historic environment when planning application goes in.

LR – both styles of plan were on view, the indicative and block plan showing houses layout.

JP – some residents on Glebe Road noted concern about the increased volume of traffic coming out of the new site and enquired about possible compensation.

CE – anything about public open space? JP reassured a few people that about  $\frac{3}{4}$  of Glebeland is being retained. MW commented that the quality of open space will be better with a play area included.

LR – green space not seen as contentious, but some people queried the layout. It will eventually be passed to the Parish Council and protected against future development.

TC – Detailed planning permission will dictate what control the landowners have over the developers. The Glebelands has more recently been used by dog walkers and no longer used for recreation purposes, so residents are not complaining about the loss of recreation space.

MW – an earlier aspiration to build a church extension, is now not required. He will speak to Andy Mason to agree and will remove it from the planning application. JP agrees and will speak to vicar, but suggests it can be dropped. New vicarage build is still important and required.

CE – cabinet report to be considered on 27<sup>th</sup> September 2017. It has been to a Directors meeting, with no issues. Steve Law will brief Cllr Steve Charmley, PH for Assets this week. The report will be public next week.

LR – query Appendix 2 (feedback from community consultation 2014). Is it out of date and therefore not a complete picture of community consultation since then?

CE – add addendum to summarise meetings since then. LR to send to JH to amend and resend. Typo in report 8.3 to change also.

<p>Financial implications are deliberately explicit in 4.3 after advice from Legal that capital receipt will fall short.  Future action, page 7 next steps making Cabinet aware. Procurement method, point c) further approval via a detailed report will be needed.</p> <p>TC – outline planning permission would be useful before Christmas to avoid any community backlash and keep momentum going forward. It would be wise to avoid putting planning application in over Christmas time to avoid public comment.</p> <p>CE – has discussed with Andy Mason re soft market testing. Shropshire Council and the Diocese are using Balfours to act as selling agent. CE needs to get dispensation from standing orders (Legal permission). SC legal team will lead on all legal matters for both landowners, signed off by Diocese. Diocese will lead on marketing.</p> <p><b>ACTION</b> – after Cabinet report is agreed on the 27<sup>th</sup> September, monthly meetings of the legal group will be needed rather than the Steering Group. SC will commission Weightmans as our legal representative due to capacity. Then there will be a lull of Steering Group meetings until after Cabinet report version 2 is agreed.</p> <p>JK – an updated ecological survey is now required. She will commission one in the next fortnight.</p> <p>MW – mentioned a concern that York House (Livability) have not been in communication. He is concerned that they have the ability to stall the process. Also the Scouts and Guides Association have not been communicating, however Andy Goldsmith had responded to this meeting invitation to say he will read the circulated report and comment.</p> <p>AG has attended parish meetings in the summer and was looking at the site at Stanley Parker playing fields. The site might not be big enough but they are looking at options. To be fair, he has not had anything to work with until the financial position known. <b>ACTION</b> - TC to chat and encourage interaction.</p> <p>JP – still awaiting written confirmation from Shropshire Council for capital receipt from Cross Lane</p> <p>DP – after Cabinet paper approved, the Council’s Finance Officer James Walton will write to confirm. It has been agreed in principle. JP cannot sell the land until written confirmation is received. DP is diarising to get confirmation from James Walton S151 officer, following Cabinet approval.</p> <p>RP queried a couple of paragraphs in the Cabinet report regarding the 5 year library strategy which is currently out to consultation so may not be appropriate to refer to in this report? Negotiations will change management arrangements going forward. <b>ACTION</b> - RP to reword paragraphs and send other options to JH to amend.</p> <p><b>ACTION</b> – CE to talk to Mike Howard at York House and will update  CH – could scouts put in planning application at the same time, although consideration of the Lythwood site might not be suitable? JK team to</p>	<p><b>JH</b></p> <p><b>JK</b></p> <p><b>TC</b></p> <p><b>DP</b></p> <p><b>RP</b></p> <p><b>CE</b></p>
--	---

	assist/advise. ACTION - JK to commission Jeremy Wray for a further design and access statement and updated plans.	<b>JK</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Any other business</b>	
	<p>MW - Appendix 1 boundary red line doesn't include vicarage? The site plan is 'for land for sale' so it doesn't include vicarage, only SC ownership. <b>ACTION</b> - JK to double check</p> <p>MW – the Diocese may retain ownership of the small piece of land beside the church because of memorial grounds being there and car park for church (new car park not existing). It will give access rights in perpetuity and will negotiate maintenance. CE - this sort of detail will be addressed in the second cabinet report.</p>	<b>JK</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Date of next meeting</b>	
	Thursday 12 <sup>th</sup> October 2017 – keep in diaries for feedback to this group following the Cabinet meeting and book a Legal group meeting if diaries allow.	<b>JH</b>