

CLIVE PARISH COUNCIL

EXTRA ORDINARY MEETING MINUTES 24 SEPT 2020

Minutes of the Extra Ordinary meeting of Clive Parish Council held virtually on Zoom on Thursday 24th Sept 2020, at 6.30pm.

Present: Cllrs Matt Alexander, Kate Bentham, Caia Bryant-Griffiths, Ann Harrison, Jon Jinks (**Vice Chairman**), Peter Slark (**Chairman**), Peter Walters.

In attendance: Lydia Bardsley (Proper Officer). Public: 28. Meeting started at 6.35 pm

66/20: CHAIRMAN'S WELCOME

Cllr Slark welcomed everyone to the meeting.

67/20: TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None received

68/20: DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS & DISPENSATION REQUESTS

No dispensation requests received.

69/20: LOCAL PLAN REVIEW: COMMUNITY HUB STATUS

Council to consider results of independent village survey re. Clive parish's designation as a Community Hub, and agree any actions.

The members of the independent group of residents gave a PowerPoint presentation on the results of their survey of the community regarding community hub status. There were serious concerns that the proposed housing guideline figure for Clive parish (30 houses) was not a maximum but a starting point and that various exception policies in the Local Plan would allow for additional development on top of that. The results of the survey showed that a large majority of respondents preferred to lose an amenity and become a Community Cluster. ***The slides from this presentation will be available as an appendix to these minutes.***

The end of the presentation gave 4 proposed steps for the Parish Council to consider taking:

1. The Parish Council informs Shropshire Council that Clive Parish withdraws its support for Community Hub status.
2. The Parish Council leads a working group to reduce the points allocation to below Hub threshold, through an amenity appraisal, within timescales of Plan consultation programme.
3. The Parish Council considers formal objection and challenge to the points allocation and scoring methodology.
4. The Parish Council commits to not supporting or lobbying for any action that will result in the village attracting further points and/or achieving Hub status, without the express approval of the electorate.

Councillors considered the presentation and shared their views.

Councillors thanked the independent group their hard work and effort in putting together this information. They queried the figures presented as the number of responses under each option didn't add up to the total returned surveys (338). The independent group confirmed that 3 surveys had both B and C options ticked so that affected final count under each header.

Councillors raised questions on Community Cluster and Open Countryside status, and the fact that further development would still be permitted even if Clive is not a Community Hub, which was not made particularly clear.

On the 1st recommendation for the PC to consider (The Parish Council formally withdraws its support for Community Hub status), it was felt that the data needs to be audited before the PC can act further, and it was uncertain whether this was feasible in the given timeframe for consultation responses. If PC can add substance to questionnaire and add credibility to it, then perhaps we can review this step. Cllrs also felt they needed to have informal advice from SC and other independent bodies before we do anything formal or informal.

It was **NOTED** that the data shows a different opinion from what had been seen over the last 2 years. Cllrs explained that they were told previously that if PC fought Community Hub status that the parish would lose control over type of housing in Clive, and that therefore the stronger position would be to accept Hub status and work with SC to negotiate on specifics. One suggestion was to challenge the points system again and perhaps this might be more effective than withdrawing support for Community Hub status.

There were concerns that the term “Managed infill” (used in reference to Community Cluster status) was not necessarily true, and that the community or PC may not have much influence/control over regulating infill.

There was some feeling that the notion of “unlimited development” under Community Hub status and that the Hub would gradually be extended over time was perhaps an exaggeration. Cllrs referenced a recent SALC Area Committee meeting where Dan Cordon (Eddie West’s deputy in the Planning department at SC) had stressed several times that one of the purposes of the Local Plan Review up to 2038 was to provide certainties. It was emphasised that while central government requires a Local Plan to be reviewed every 5 years, this would be a review, and not a complete re-write of the existing plan, and that the 5 yearly reviews were not an excuse to keep adding to the housing figures gradually.

It was **NOTED** that the PC has to work with SC whether it likes it or not, but that there is nothing to stop this independent group who have put the survey together from sending their results to SC themselves as part of their own response to consultation.

The chair then opened the floor to comments from other participants:

Comments were made on timing of this survey and that it would have been more effective at the beginning of the year, and that it had caused confusion in the community. Others felt that the independent survey was fantastic, and wanted to prevent Clive from becoming like larger settlements on the scale of Hadnall and Baschurch.

Resident who was a chartered planner and had worked in Eddie West’s team emphasised that Hierarchy of Settlements is fundamental; a Community Hub is higher in the hierarchy than Community Cluster and Open Countryside, and that means having development across a scale appropriate to the each type of settlement. Some policies (e.g. affordable housing exception site policies) do equally apply to Clusters, but that is set within the hierarchy, so Community Hubs will naturally get more development than Clusters, and Clusters will naturally get more development than Open Countryside, and it gets progressively more restrictive. They also explained that all applications for housing would be assessed against policy SP5 (design policy), and that all policies are interlinked and used in conjunction with one another, not in isolation. They also reminded everyone that every planning application is consulted on, so there were lots of steps that will maintain control of development irrespective of where you are in the hierarchy of settlements.

They also questioned the idea of “certainty” mentioned earlier, as this was possibly more for SC’s purposes, in terms of housing supply to maintain weight and soundness of the Local Plan. They also felt that the policies that will get reviewed every 5 years will be around housing supply, and cautioned that the new government targets for housing supply are ambitious, so they felt the timing is right to be having this conversation.

Another resident asked when the decision over whether Clive becomes a Community Hub or not is likely to be made. Previously the PC had been told that if at any time Clive drops points before the Local Plan is finalised and submitted to central government then Clive would come out of Community Hub status. It was expected that it would be around 6-9 months before the Local Plan is submitted to central government for examination (at least 2-3 months to review responses from this stage of consultation, possibly 2-3 months to make changes to draft Local Plan, then resubmit to

SC cabinet for approval, final 6-week public consultation, review responses 1-2 months, final changes to draft Local Plan 1-2 months, approval at SC cabinet, then submit to central government).

A resident then announced that the village shop would close in the next few months, which would drop Clive just below the points threshold for Community Hub. This was a mutual decision between tenants and landlord, and the timing was coincidental and not manufactured in order to influence Clive Community Hub status.

Cllrs were surprised and saddened to hear this news and expressed how much the shop will be missed as a valued community amenity, and a place for social interaction. Whilst this changed the situation, there were some concerns that SC would need to be convinced that the shop would be closed permanently in order to take this into account for the points score for Clive. There were also some concerns about amenities “yo-yoing” between being closed and re-opening later, possibly in different places, and that this might cause further confusion in the parish. The landlord of the shop gave assurances that the building 7a high street will **not** re-open as shop, but couldn’t speak for what others may choose to do.

It was **AGREED** that, with permission from the landlord and tenant, that the PC will notify SC as soon as possible that the shop will close in the next few months.

The Clerk will obtain detailed information on what it would mean to become Open Countryside or a Community Cluster. It was **NOTED** that the PC would by default drop to Open Countryside if the points score changes, and would need to formally opt in to become a Community Cluster, and that Open Countryside is quite restrictive. It was felt that there may need to be another round of consultation on what community wants to be.

It was **RESOLVED** that Council would factor in the shop closure into its response to the Local Plan Consultation, but it was **NOTED** that it will not be able to survey the community on preferred settlement status (Community Cluster or Open Countryside) before the consultation deadline of 30th Sept.

It was **NOTED** that, given the new information, it may not be quite such a priority for the PC to audit the independent survey results, but that these would be brought to the chair to pass on to the clerk, who would check these and hold them for public record.

The PC was asked whether it would consider the 4th recommendation on the presentation (commit to not supporting or lobbying for any action that will result in the village attracting further points and/or achieving Hub status). It was **AGREED** that this would be discussed at the next PC meeting in October.

The Council reminded participants about the casual vacancy on the PC and invited people to stand for co-option if an election hadn’t been called.

70/20: NEXT MEETING

It was **RESOLVED** that the next Ordinary Parish Council meeting would take place on Thursday 15th October at 7pm online.

There being no further business, the chairman thanked everyone for their participation and closed the meeting at: 7.37pm