

# CLIVE PARISH COUNCIL

Parish Clerk/RFO Miss Lydia Bardsley, 164 Cabin Lane, Oswestry, SY11 2PF  
Tel: 01691 238267 E-mail: [clivepc@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:clivepc@hotmail.co.uk). Website: [www.cliveparishcouncil.org](http://www.cliveparishcouncil.org)

---

Minutes of the meeting of Clive Parish Council **Local Plan Review Committee** held in Clive Village Hall on Thursday 10 January 2019 at 7.30pm.

**Present** Cllrs Kate Bentham, Jon Jinks, Ann Harrison, Matt Alexander, Caia Bryant-Griffiths, Graham Godfrey-White, Peter Walters

**In attendance** Lydia Bardsley, Clerk/RFO, Public: 13

LPR/11/18 **TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** – Cllr Peter Slark

LPR/12/18 **OPEN FORUM** – it was proposed to move the Open Forum segment until after the minutes were approved.

**Residents asked about challenging the points allocated to Clive**, and the chairman explained that these had been carefully scrutinised by the councillors and some points had already been removed in terms of the pharmacy, and most recently the bowling green, which has reduced Clive's points from 54 to 51. Clive currently is only 3 points away from dropping out of Community Hub status. It was noted that although it is frustrating, the points system works on where Clive stands **here and now**. It was reiterated that if the shop (or any other amenity/service worth 3 or more points) were to close at any point between now and the final plan being submitted to government (expected to be towards the end of 2019), then Clive would drop to 48 points (or below) and at that point Clive would not become a Community Hub.

It was clarified that any allocated sites would still have to go through the formal planning process.

**It was queried whether the obligation of being a Community Hub couldn't be met by infill development.**

This point has been raised frequently in the feedback received so far, and it does seem a better fit with how the village has grown historically. The response to this question when raised at the Shirehall meeting in December was that it might prove difficult to encourage a developer or landowner to agree to release land for just infill that as they wouldn't get much return. In any case CLV010 is the main point of discussion, and how would we propose to fulfil the proposed housing numbers if CLV010 is not allocated.

**It was queried whether feedback received so far was predominantly against being a Community Hub.**

Clive Parish Council has tried to appear neutral in these discussions, and the eventual decision has to be led by the village opinion. If the Council was to vote 6 to 2 in favour of being a Community Hub whilst the majority of the village was against it, then that would not sit right with us.

A resident commented that there are some distinct advantages of being a Hub, and maybe it would be acceptable to have fewer houses but still have a defined boundary. Since Clive hasn't got the means to fight the Community Hub status, we need to make it work for our community. If we don't get involved we'll have very little say in what goes on, besides which we have actually asked for extra housing in our Parish Plan.

**By request, the Council explained Community Clusters.**

As far as the Parish Council is concerned, being a Community Cluster wasn't really an option for Clive until the discussions last week. Community Cluster status allows only for infill, but no fixed boundary around the village. There is a risk that infill on these terms could create opportunities for more infill and there is no cap on housing figures so it could get out of control.

If Clive stayed as Open Countryside it could fall foul to Rural Exception Schemes (100%

affordable housing) anywhere in or around Clive if a local need for such housing has been established. If the proposed Cross-subsidy policy is approved during this current stage of the consultation these sites could end up being a mix of affordable and open market housing.

Residents raised concerns about the proposed site allocation CLV010 and felt an eastern site allocation would be much better. It was felt that coming to negotiations with an open mind with regard to Hub status would put the Parish Council in a better position. One resident felt that the way the questions had been presented in the consultation, that it was inevitable that residents would be negatively predisposed against any development in the village without considering the possible benefits of being a Community Hub and having some housing.

Residents were reminded that they can and should reply to the consultation themselves.

**A resident questioned if there was any point in voicing their opinions if ultimately Clive will become a Hub no matter residents think.**

The Council explained that they have been in discussions with Shropshire Council for a long time about this, and that they have successfully negotiated the housing figures from an initial figure of 120 houses down to 60 and now 40, so the community is being listened to. It was mentioned as a common point in feedback received so far, that there is a lack of 1-2 bedroom bungalows for current residents to move into. If developers built 40 houses for retirement homes, this would free up larger homes for other people to move into, and therefore create housing stock to fulfil the needs of families etc.

**Fears were raised that infrastructure was not being taken into account in the points system.**

It was clarified that existing infrastructure is considered as part of the normal planning process, rather than in the points system at this stage of the consultation. Issues like drainage, highways safety etc., are standard planning considerations, regardless of Community Hub status or the allocation of CLV010. It's at that point that objections come in etc. One of the benefits of CLV010 from a developer's point of view is that larger developments are more cost efficient for developers for improving the infrastructure, and conversely smaller sites would bring less opportunity for infrastructure improvements.

**Concerns were raised about existing demands on the Doctors' surgery,** with a 3 week wait for appointments currently. It was reiterated that this would be a consideration in the planning application process, and that apparently the Clinical Commissioning Group will advise on whether the Clive Medical Centre has sufficient capacity for the expected increase in patient numbers.

**Concerns about the road infrastructure were raised.** Again this would have to be taken into account when planning applications go in. Improvements such as street lighting and pavements need to be paid for, and the developer probably won't pay for it. Why would they come to Clive where they would have to invest more on infrastructure if they could go to Baschurch where they already have streetlights etc.?

**Concerns about the future of the village shop were raised again.** It was reiterated that the Council can't really discuss the private commercial situation with regard to the shop, as it is somebody else's venture and at the moment that venture is currently open. It was noted that the points score for being a Community Hub did not just hinge on the shop, i.e. if the mobile library service stopped before the Local Plan is submitted to government, then that would also trigger Clive coming out of proposed Community Hub status.

**Need for unity.** A resident felt it was important to explain to the community why the Council has taken a certain stance when they do respond to the consultation. So that individual responses will hopefully reflect and back up that stance. There is a general feeling that residents don't want CLV010 as the site allocation, and almost all feedback received didn't want as many as 40 houses, so there is a united front in these two respects.

**Site allocation:** It was noted that in the detailed site assessments, that CLV010 scored "Fair" overall in terms of suitability for development, but that other sites scored "Good". There are material arguments against CLV010, not just objections to being overlooked (which is not a material consideration), but issues like drainage, road safety etc. There is also the feeling that a

large development on one site would totally change the visual nature of the village, especially on that side of the village, which would not be the case with smaller parcels of land.

**Communication with residents:** A resident raised concerns that many people don't understand or even know about the development, and was there anything the Parish Council could do to get their views as well? Unfortunately the Council would need much more time to organise the kind of communication suggested and the Council needs to agree its official response at the next full Council meeting on 17<sup>th</sup> January in order to submit it before the consultation deadline of 31<sup>st</sup> January. Unfortunately we only have a matter of days to formulate a response if we want to be heard.

Councillor Jinks closed the Open Forum segment and thanked the public for their input. Residents were reminded that whatever the Committee (and eventually the full Council) decides, it will not just be the councillors' opinions; it will be based on all the feedback received, as well as a thorough analysis of all the consultation reports and information available. The public were welcome to stay for the remainder of the discussions, and email any further comments after the end of the meeting.

All but two residents left the meeting.

LPR/13/18 **DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS** - Declaration of any disclosable pecuniary interest in a matter to be discussed at the meeting and which is not included in the register of interests. (**Members are reminded that they are required to leave the room during the discussion and voting on matters in which they have a disclosable pecuniary interest**, whether or not the interest is entered in the register of members' interests maintained by the Monitoring Officer).

There were none.

LPR/14/18 **DISPENSATION** – To consider any requests from Committee members for dispensation (requests for dispensation should be in writing and addressed to the clerk prior to the meeting.)

None received.

LPR/15/18 **MINUTES** – It was **RESOLVED** to approve and sign the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> Dec 2018.

LPR/16/18 **SHROPSHIRE COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN REVIEW**

The Committee discussed the feedback received:

**Human rights:** Good examples had been provided where this did have an impact on planning applications. Once planning application process starts, a resident has highlighted that quality of life is a relevant consideration. However for discussions at this stage in the consultation it was felt that the human rights argument was not relevant.

After some initial discussion on feedback received it was felt it would be better to deal with each question in reverse order.

**Site allocation: CLV010**

Every response so far (except one) has been to object to this site. The Committee **AGREED** to object to this site.

Given that there are no pavements on that road, the number of people who would have to drive from CLV010 to the school is a very strong argument against this site. Since traffic and dangerous roads were of great concern it was questioned whether there could be an option of looking North rather than West or East. It was felt that the Wem road (North) is a wider road so potentially safer. In terms of comparing the site assessments for CLV008 and CLV010, they are almost equal. CLV008 was given a sustainability score of "Good" (with potential for 20 houses) and CLV010 was given a sustainability score of "Fair".

One of the attractions of developing on the eastern side of the village is there is less available space. This means they would have to be smaller houses, which would make them more affordable. Maybe North and East would be a better combination.

The original potential housing numbers for the following sites was clarified:

CLV013 – 7 houses

CLV017 – 30 houses [This was felt to be unrealistic].

CLV018 – 21 houses

CLV008 – 20 houses

CLV010 – 60 houses [Original figure proposed in the summer, current proposal is for 25]

It was noted that there are already 12 properties on Field Drive which is opposite CLV010.

**Housing number: 40**

The Committee felt that all feedback received was universally against having 40 houses, and the committee members agreed that this did not seem an appropriate number. The Committee was reminded that Eddie West had mentioned that Shropshire Council themselves were aiming for an overall housing figure for the whole county that was 15% more than the government requirement. It was felt that Clive could be in a good position because Clive represents a tiny percentage of the overall housing requirement needed in Shropshire and the Council might not want to spend time arguing over 40 houses. Clive is the second smallest proposed Community Hub after Bicton, but while the 20% increase in housing seems unreasonable it is actually in line with other settlements so that is not a great argument against the housing figure itself. It was felt that the lack of infrastructure in the village was a better reason to object as other settlements have streetlights, parking spaces, wider roads, etc. All feedback received whether in writing or verbally was that no one wanted to change the historic character of village, and that it would be a real shame to have to install streetlights etc.

There was some speculation that Shropshire Council could have looked at historic growth numbers and established that 25 houses had been built in Clive over the past 20 years, which may have helped them reach their current figure. There is a chance they are expecting the Parish Council to negotiate for fewer houses under Hub status. If the lowest housing figure from all 39 proposed Community Hubs is 30 there's an argument that 25 is too low a figure to ask for.

If we accepted 30 houses what style would the community want them to be? Of those 30 houses, 20 need to be sensible, retirement style houses. There was also the suggestion of insisting on a similar model to what was used in Cross Houses, e.g. local status e.g. to be eligible to buy you had to have lived within a certain radius of the settlement. A model like that would help meet the need for homes for children of residents so they can stay in Clive, and this has been raised in the feedback but also in the Parish Plan.

There was some discussion as to whether developers would be interested in building the kind of homes the community needs in Clive as there would be less profit than larger open market homes, and it was suggested that developers may focus first on other development areas in Shropshire that offer the opportunity for the largest margins. There was the suggestion of approaching a Housing Trust who may be interested in developing the kind of housing needed in Clive, but they may no longer be interested now that Shropshire Council has said they are planning to build 25 houses elsewhere in the village.

Cllr Bentham gave her apologies and left the meeting at 20.45.

**Development boundary:**

The feedback received so far suggests that not everyone who has responded understood what was being asked in this question, especially seeing as people who objected to site CLV010 would automatically have objected to the proposed development boundary (which included CLV010) without realising they could also suggest an alternate boundary.

The general consensus seemed to be that people want a boundary to restrict future development, but it might not be in right place. It was felt it would be best to aim to keep the development boundary as tight around the current developed area as possible now, but accept that it might change with any

change of government, policy etc. It was felt that no one in the village wanted limitless development in the surrounding countryside, and that no one wanted the vagueness of having no development boundary.

[The issue of communicating with residents was raised again, but it was felt it was too late for any large scale communication to have any real effect at this point due to the timeframes of the consultation deadline. It was also noted that the Parish Council had communicated about the Local Plan Review in print via the newsletter.

It was also felt that a large proportion of households in the middle of the village would not be particularly affected by the propose development, and therefore would have no strong opinion on the current proposals, as opposed to those residents living near site CLV010, who would be greatly impacted and consequently have been very keen to share their views.]

**Hub status:**

There were concerns that if Clive became a Community Cluster (instead of a Community Hub) that Clive would be potentially open to limitless infill development, as there would be no development boundary and no housing guideline figure, as well as being susceptible to Rural Exception Scheme or Cross-Subsidy affordable housing (without a say in the matter).

In general more committee members were in favour of being a Community Hub for various reasons, but in terms of feedback from residents the general feeling was that the village was more in favour of Community Cluster status. As a Parish Council it was felt that by objecting the Community Hub status outright, that it could become impossible to have any input in this process, whereas if we agree to become a Community Hub then we have more influence over the housing figure, boundary, site allocation, and what type of development. This would therefore be more likely to meet the needs of the community in the next twenty years. It was felt that having a defined development boundary would be the key reason for accepting Community Hub status.

**It was AGREED that the clerk would seek immediate clarification on whether being a Community Hub would prevent Clive from having Rural Exception Schemes for affordable housing thrust upon us outside any development boundary.**

If it doesn't, then there is no real advantage in being a Community Hub over being a Community Cluster, and essentially the development boundary would be meaningless.

It was clarified that if the Parish Council was to support Community Hub status, it would be on the basis that CLV010 is not within the development boundary, and that the boundary includes alternative sites instead. It was felt that if the Parish Council co-operates with the Planning Authority on Community Hub status but makes reasonable and well-considered suggestions for alternative sites, then it is unlikely that we would still have CLV010 imposed upon us. So far there are only two people who prefer the CLV010 site: Eddie West as it was his original proposal, and the landowner who wants to sell the land. We have to assume that Shropshire Council will take on board what we've said, and be willing to negotiate; otherwise the whole consultation process has been pointless.

It was AGREED that part of the Parish Council's official consultation response should mention that **even** the Shropshire Council representative agreed that CLV010 might not be the best site. The original proposal of CLV010 was a matter of an opinion that was itself based on the Planning Authority's limited knowledge of the village. Additionally, since then the Parish Council has identified other sites that the site assessments identify as having a better suitability score than CLV010.

**It was AGREED that the clerk would compile all comments received into one document for clarity.**

The final 2 members of the public left the meeting at 21.08.

**It was AGREED that Cllr Walters would do some bullet points on what was said at the Shirehall meeting in December, so that can be incorporated into the Parish Council's response.**

It was **AGREED** that all Council members should think hard as individual committee members about what they want to say at the next meeting on the 17<sup>th</sup>. Anyone who can't come on 17<sup>th</sup> please forward your views as well. We need a response by the end of that meeting.

It was noted that there is indeed a need to free up housing stock in the village. By having properties that allow people to move out of their existing homes to other homes that is creating housing stock. That would then free up the bigger homes for families etc., and would fulfil a need within the village. The age profile of the public at the parish meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> Jan was noted (only 3 or 4 people under 40 and a high percentage over 55). It was suggested that a number of those people who are very keen to stay in Clive would welcome the opportunity to move into smaller homes within the village, although it was pointed out that not all those existing houses would be affordable for younger buyers i.e. there is still a need for housing in the £200,000 range.

Cllr Jinks thanked all the committee members for their time and input and closed the meeting.

LPR/17/18 **NEXT MEETING** – no date agreed as yet.  
**Meeting closed: 21.20**

DRAFT