

# **CLAVERDON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN GROUP**

## *Minutes of Group Meeting 3rd October 2016*

**Present :** Mr. J. Cronin (Chairman) : Mesdames. Lorna Perkins : Anne Marshall : Messrs. Dan. O'Donnell : Charlie Waterworth : Andrew Williams : Councillors Simon Lawton : David Middleton : Tony Rodger: Hazel Spiers: John Horner

### **Apologies**

Mr. Neil Pearce suggested that it was not cost effective for him to attend the meeting, as there were no issues on the agenda that would necessarily require his presence, but if any points arose, during its course, he would answer them separately.

### **1 Minutes of the last meeting.**

1.1 On the proposal of the Chairman, the minutes of the meeting held on 25th July 2016 as circulated as draft 2, with the agenda were approved and later, signed as a correct record.

### **2 Policy Objectives**

Having held individual group meetings to consider what policies should be put forward for inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan and issues that may influence them, The Groups reported as below.

The Chairman said that all groups should circulate a copy of the proposals to all and with comments to be returned by all members by 14<sup>th</sup> November.

### **2.1 Housing**

It was emphasised that any policies put forward have to relate to the SDC Core Strategy and to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). and as a Category 3 Local Service Village could nominally be required to take up to 45 new houses by 2031. Claverdon has extant consent for 12 new houses, two of which are under construction so a maximum of 33 could be required/provided. However, the picture is complicated by the fact that the current Government Policy is that development is not permitted in the Green Belt. It should be borne in mind, however, that with changes of Government this could be at risk

As a green belt village any development need to comply with CS.10. This restricts development to being

- Small scale development, not to harm openness of the green belt
- Small scale extension/alteration or replacement of existing building
- Limited development/in-filling of previously developed (brownfield) sites. This must not have a materially adverse impact on the openness of the green belt.
- Limited In-fill development in LSV's

### **Claverdon residents survey**

#### **2.1.1**

The analysis of the returns from the Questionnaires shows there to be an overriding want for there to be no further development in The Village of any type. Nominally, therefore, there is no mandate to call for new housing in the plan, or to nominate any potential land for new building in The Plan. This is compounded

*by a desire that any development whatsoever be within the existing defined village boundary. There is no support either for specialist residential such as care homes, housing designed for the elderly/infirm. It would be unwise, however, to leave it open to outside bodies to nominate areas of land, in the event of having new building forced on The Village.*

*Small scale development policy options.*

- 2.1.2 It is therefore suggested that at least the following possibilities are considered.*
- 2.1.3 Suggested that we do not include in the NP any specific target or attempt to identify any specific sites for development.*
  - 2.1.3.1 No individual building site should be contemplated for more than (5) houses.*
  - 2.1.3.2 There are very limited in-fill development opportunities within the village boundary but as there is no mandate to extend the existing village boundary. However, we should include as policy that we would not object to limited in-fill within the village boundary if a site became available.*
  - 2.1.3.3 A satellite boundary outside of the Village Boundary but inside the Parish boundary where new build could be accommodated could be drawn up, with possible sites to include Kington Lane , Yarningale Common and Lye Green*
  - 2.1.3.4 Nominate Claverdon Land Trust as a preferred provider of local needs scheme and support proposals for limited, gradual development where local demand is proven via housing needs survey (we believe the current survey is still valid in terms of timescale)*
  - 2.1.3.5 Development Land in the Green Belt needs to be sustainable and to be immediately adjacent to the Village Boundary.*
  - 2.1.3.6 Any new build sites should include a mixture of Private and Social Housing.*
  - 2.1.3.7 The Village Design Statement should be re-issued updating it to include present day thinking. Small -scale extension/alteration/replacement buildings.*
  - 2.1.3.8 - To mirror the current Core Strategy where sympathetic extensions will be permitted and replacement buildings so long as they conform to good design and do not affect the openness of the green belt.*
  - 2.1.3.9 Brown Field Development*
  - 2.1.3.10 - Within the village boundary brownfield sites put forward for development will be acceptable in principle.*
  - 2.1.3.11 - Brownfield policy may extend to any previously developed areas within the parish boundary and/or any satellite residential areas.*
  - 2.1.3.12 -Any development must qualify to be an improvement i.e. the removal of an eyesore site or bringing into use derelict buildings etc.*
  - 2.1.3.13 Limited in-fill sites*
  - 2.1.3.14 - Any in-fill should be just that, in-fill between existing structures and not “back garden” developments*
  - 2.1.3.15 If a property with a wide frontage is proposed for demolition to fit in new smaller properties with road frontages this would in principle be acceptable.*

*This led to some discussion as to what constitutes infill, Councillor Rodger suggesting that the section on Station Road between the Telephone Exchange and The 'Tin Tabernacle' site should be infill, but Councillor Lawton pointing out that this has already been designated not to be the case in the eyes of the Stratford D.C. Planners.*

*2.1.3.16 There should be a policy for Conservation Areas.*

*2.1.4 There was some discussion following during which the following points were made :-*

*2.1.4.1 Once the N.P. is in force, care would have to be taken to avoid any abuse of the plans.*

*2.1.4.2 It is a matter of concern that it has been suggested that Birmingham may need additional space for housing which could overflow into The District, in which event it would pose the question as to what happens to allocation of new housing.*

*2.1.4.3 Whilst Green Belt is safe from new building, Government has the power to change the area : The Village border should not be used as the boundary inside which limitations are to be placed, because this could be changed by the District Council. The Parish Boundary cannot be altered : The fact being a Conservation Area is a very strong reason for or against housing proposals, but compliance to NPPF is paramount.*

*2.2 Green Spaces*

*2.2.1 Green Spaces as follows being considered to be preserved.*

*2.2.1.1 Yarningale Common*

*2.2.1.2 Lye Green*

*2.2.1.3 The Village green*

*2.2.1.4 Area and Facilities around D.M. Hall*

*2.2.1.5 Recreation Field*

*2.2.1.6 Church Centre, graveyard and Glebe Field*

*2.2.1.7 Woodland to the rear of Highcroft*

*2.2.1.8 Land to the rear to the side of Crown Farm, opposite The Crown / Hercules Farm*

*2.2.1.9 The old Boys Club Football Pitch, off Breach Land, to the rear of The School.*

*2.2.1.10 Two Public Houses – nominate as Village Amenities*

*2.2.1.11 Parking Area on Lye Green Road adjacent to the old Butcher's Shop*

*2.2.1.12 Green Triangle at the junction of St. Michael's Road / Langley Road*

*2.2.1.13 Sheltered Housing - used by trust on church land - lease to expire soon....?*

*2.2.2 The question was raised as to whether footpaths should be included in the list of Green Spaces to be preserved. There was some discussion on this, but in the end it was agreed that there are too many in and around The Village to make a list that could be effectively handled, so they will not be individually noted.*

*2.2.3 The question was asked whether the Neighbourhood Plan could be used as a mechanism to exclude any nominated Green Spaces from future residential development. There was a feeling that this would be worthwhile, if it were possible to do so and The Chairman said that he would raise the matter with Mr. Pearce.*

- 2.3 *Local Economy / Business*
- 2.3.1 *The analysis of the returns from the questionnaires shows a clear majority not being keen on having any business development in The Village, despite there being a call for a 'Craft Centre' type of business park in the Parish Plan. It should, however, be noted that quite a lot of 'Working from Home' activity already goes on in The Village, and this needs supporting particularly in areas such as communications, not the least of which is better Broadband – this being patchy across The Village.*
- 2.3.2 *Questions were raised such as*
- 2.3.2.1 *Whether existing businesses should be defined for commercial use,*
- 2.3.2.2 *Whether there should be a policy covering prevention of turning business in to housing in the event of its being designated as a Community Asset.*
- 2.3.3 *Following some discussion, during which the recent difficulties over the renewal of The Red Lion lease: the fact of the high regard, currently held in The Village, for both The Crown and The Red Lion : That The 'Tin Tabernacle' building which was Office Space is now a residential house, with planning permission for a second to be built on the same site : and that whereas The Village used to have two shops (The Corner shop at The Green and the Butcher / Greengrocer / Post Office were all noted, it was suggested that policies should be worked up covering –*
- 2.3.3.1 *Broadband improvements required*
- 2.3.3.2 *That current commercial sites should be retained.*
- 2.4 *Leisure, Recreation, Amenities*
- 2.4.1 *Recreation Ground Facilities*
- 2.4.1.1 *The Village Recreation field has various issues which need addressing and it is felt that they should be given separate priorities of review/improvement rather than treating it as a whole project.*
- 2.4.1.2 *Whilst The Playground Areas on the Recreation Field met the legal and functional requirements of the time when they were constructed, both of these aspects have now moved on the facilities have become very 'tired' and are in need of overall refurbishment. A group of Villagers is already raising funds towards this being done, with anticipated costs anticipated to be in the order of £30,000. She is currently fundraising for this, and the Crown Pub has also pledged some of their recent charity day funds towards this project.*
- 2.4.1.3 *The area on the Recreation Field, to the rear of the Pavilion could Ideally be used for a car park which would alleviate the problems experienced by the residents in Langley road , with by cars being parked there during football and cricket matches and training. However, the cost/funding/type of surfacing needs reviewing.*
- 2.4.1.4 *The pavilion is wooden construction and now quite elderly and not suited to today's needs, especially in respect of things like changing facilities (separate male, female and Referee). Funding this will need reviewing. Charlie advises that is important to continue to use the field for children's training, as grant funding is more accessible.*
- 2.4.1.5 *The Old Boys Club football field behind The School is occasionally used as an 'overflow site', but is not considered suitable for a site for development of a multi sports venue and is, in any case earmarked for use by The School. Mrs Gover, the headmistress commented that looking forward she advised that the school would like to look at the possibility of having a pre-school nursery*

next to it, to accommodate 3-4 year olds before they start school, which could be run as a partnership between the school and a current private provider. They have the use of the Old Boys Club field, which they use for cross-country and sports. The school insures it for public liability and it is registered with the Charities Commission. It is considered a useful asset, but she feels it would be difficult to move forward with any large plans/changes for its use, due to legal ownership implications, and legal costs and funding to provide better facilities such as an all-weather surface. Mrs Gover is a trustee, along with Gary Knight and Warren Heath

2.4.1.6 The Football club is well supported by members and local businesses, who sponsor it. It also provides business for the Crown pub, which after a 4 year period of being unwelcoming to village life, is now thriving. The Tennis Club is still campaigning for lighting, and it is thought that numbers may wain if it never happens. It is noted that temporary generated lights could be used without planning, however this would create a noise issue. As people use the tennis club in the Summer months until 8-9.00pm, could lighting be controlled so that it would be turned off at a certain time. If the membership reduces and it is not used, consideration should given as to what the area would be used for? If not used at all, it could end up covered in weeds and a wasted space.

The Rugby Club continues to thrive well and attract players from all age groups. Simon Lawton added that they have recently obtained a grant from the Sports Council to support sizeable expansion of the Club House and improvement of facilities.

2.4.1.7 The School is considering the possibility of having a pre-school annexe and the parking for parking for the staff remains an issue. Funding for operations in schools comes directly from Government but that Classrooms comes from County Council. This means that in the present atmosphere of cuts at local levels, a new building for this proposed annexe could be at risk. The Head Mistress has expressed an interest in coming on to the N.P. Working Group to discuss this.

2.4.1.7.1 Leading on from this latter point, there was some discussion as to whether the Working Group should include representatives from D.M. Hall, Church Centre, Crown PH, Red Lion PH and Community Shop. The Chairman said that the membership should be as wide based as possible.

2.5 Utilities/Renewable Energy – Councillor Rodger reporting

2.5.1 Councillor Rodger suggested that this section should be combined with item 2.3 and headed 'Infrastructure' and should include the policies to support –

2.5.1.1 Bringing Town Gas in to The Village

2.5.1.2 Get an improved 'bus service with regular service to Stratford, Solihull, Warwick, Leamington

2.5.1.3 Support car parking facilities adjacent to the Station, which could also encompass a small commercial development.

- 2.6 *Road Safety - Councillor Rodger reporting  
Policies Suggested to be worked up :-*
- 2.6.1 *Have a second advisory speed sign for traffic coming in to The Village from the Warwick direction*
- 2.6.2 *Put in average speed cameras*
- 2.6.3 *Improve road safety at The Green, incorporating changes to take out the separate lane for traffic from Henley Road to Lye Green Road.*
- 2.6.4 *Introduce bus stops.*
  
- 3 *Date of Next Meeting.*
- 3.1 *The next meeting will be held on Monday 28th November 6:30 p.m. at The Church Centre.*