



Steering Group Meeting note

Stratford on Avon SHLAA

Attendees

CD Chris Dadds
SJ Sharon Jefferies
DJ David Jones
ML Martyn Luscombe
MR Miranda Rogers
RM Ruth McKeown
GM Greg Mitchell
MS Mark Sullivan

of

Baker Associates
Baker Associates
Stratford on Avon District Council
Residents Against Shottery Expansion
Stansgate Planning
Hallam Land Management
Gallagher Estates
Council for the Protection of Rural
England

Date 12 February 2009 **Time** 14.00
Location Stratford on Avon Council offices

Apologies

Andy Cowan Warwickshire County Council
Karen Rose GOWM
Paul Bayliss WMRA
Rohan Torkildsen English Heritage
Marion Hinton Environment Agency
Graham Senser Orbit Housing Association

Circulation of notes: All invited parties

Meeting purpose

To provide an update on progress to date and for the Steering Group to provide comments.

To agree a list of sites that will be considered by the Stakeholder Panel, to test viability of sites which are already considered suitable and available.

Record of main points & Actions

| | | |
|----------|--|-------|
| 1 | Progress to date | |
| 1.1 | CD provided an update on the progress made so far on the SHLAA, as follows: | |
| 1.2 | Draft methodology has been consulted upon and agreed. The methodology has a reduced threshold from the original study. The SHLAA is now looking at sites which will yield 6+ dwellings, inside and adjacent to development boundaries of Stratford-upon-Avon and the 8 Main Rural Centres. | |
| 1.3 | Invitation for sites to be put forward was publicized widely in November 2008. This "Call for sites" provided 35 new sites and further information on 20 sites which had previously been assessed as part of the original SHLAA study. | |
| 1.4 | A letter was sent in early 2009 to all agents responsible for planning applications, which are approved, but not implemented as at 1 April 2008. This was to assess deliverability of the sites. CD still awaiting responses on some of these sites. | |
| 1.5 | All sites identified from the range of sources have been assessed, and site visits have been completed by the consultants. | |
| 1.6 | Following site assessments and site visits, meetings were held between the consultants and the Council to collate information. | |
| 1.7 | The consultants now have a view on the majority of the sites. | |
| 1.8 | Maps were presented for each settlement, providing the consultants current view on each of the sites assessed. | |
| | | |
| 2 | Steering Group discussion | |
| 2.1 | Comments were provided from the Steering Group, relating to taking the SHLAA forward and drafting the report, which are to be taken forward by the consultants. Details of these comments are provided below: | CD/SJ |
| | | |

| | | |
|-------------|---|-------|
| 2.2 | <i>Local Choice Housing (Adopted Policy COM1)</i> | |
| 2.3 | The Steering Group explored the opportunities for the delivery of housing in villages through the COM1 Policy to be accounted for by the SHLAA as a Broad Location. | |
| 2.4 | COM1 was adopted as part of the Local Plan Review in 2006 but there has been limited delivery of sites from the source in the period since. | |
| 2.5 | The policy provides positive encouragement to development but specific sites cannot be identified. Therefore potentially the delivery of local choice housing in the villages could be considered as a Broad Location within the SHLAA. | |
| 2.6 | DJ explained that the Local Choice Policy will potentially be applied to all villages in the Core Strategy but at present applies to the Local centre Villages. | |
| 2.7 | It was agreed that if there are any COM1 sites identified and available that they could be included within the SHLAA. | CD/SJ |
| 2.8 | There was a discussion about the number of homes that could be accounted for in the SHLAA if the Local Choice policy was taken forward into the Core Strategy. | |
| 2.9 | The Steering Group concluded that there is not sufficient evidence to date to provide a robust figure for the delivery of housing from this source. | |
| 2.10 | It was concluded that no figure for the delivery of housing as a result of Policy COM1 would be appropriate at present. However, the Council should continuously monitor this policy to inform future revisions of the SHLAA, to potentially include as a Broad Location. | DJ |
| | | |
| 2.11 | <i>All sites adjacent development boundaries</i> | |
| 2.12 | Members of the Steering Group criticized the presentation of initial findings as there was a clear distinction drawn between those sites within Draft Core Strategy Development Opportunities and those outside. It was agreed by the Steering Group that the Opportunity areas remain in draft only and may be subject to change. | CD/SJ |

| | | |
|-------------|--|--|
| | Therefore the SHLAA should simply reflect the analysis included in the original study relating to Broad Locations adjacent to settlements | |
| 2.13 | All sites adjacent to the development boundary of study settlements, which are within Broad Locations identified previously, should be shown as such in the review of the SHLAA. There should be no distinction made between the sites within Broad Locations and those within Core Strategy development opportunities. | |
| 2.14 | It was agreed that the SHLAA should not 'rank' sites, and that this is the role of the Core Strategy. | |
| | | |
| 2.15 | <i>Small sites adjacent development boundaries</i> | |
| 2.16 | There was a discussion about small sites adjacent to the development boundary of study settlements. The draft Core Strategy provides for potentially permitting development on small sites, on the edge of a settlement (Policy CS1). | |
| 2.17 | It was agreed that accepting these small sites in the SHLAA would increase the supply of housing and it was argued by members of the Steering group that this might provide for development in more sustainable locations than the larger Broad Locations. | |
| 2.18 | It was highlighted that the current Core Strategy policy CS1 does not provide a threshold. It was also highlighted that the policy criteria to select these sites had not been through a rigorous process and therefore sites might be selected that later might be rejected, due to revisions of the policy after consultation. | |
| 2.19 | It was agreed that sites which appear to meet the criteria of the policy should be identified by the SHLAA in order to provide the Council with the maximum range of opportunities to provide housing in the future. However, it is acknowledged that the policy CS1 has no current status as it remains in draft only. | |

| | | |
|-----------|--|-------|
| | | |
| 3 | <i>Presentation of mapping & sites</i> | |
| 3.1 | It was agreed that there needs to be changes to the presentation of maps, so that the SHLAA did not indicate that the draft Core Strategy Development Opportunities were any more developable than other Broad Locations, as identified in the last SHLAA. | CD/SJ |
| 3.2 | CD/SJ will look at all mapping and ensure the sites are clearly presented in the SHLAA report. | CD/SJ |
| | | |
| 4 | Sites to be considered by the Panel | |
| 4.1 | A list of sites to be discussed by the Panel was considered by the Steering Group. | |
| 4.2 | Due to previous discussions relating to SHLAA sites, a revised list of potentially developable sites will be circulated to the Steering Group for agreement. | CD |
| 4.3 | The potential developable sites will be sent to the Panel, for consideration of viability, at a meeting w/c 9 th March 2009. | CD |
| | | |
| 5. | Windfalls | |
| 5.1 | After discussion it was agreed that a review of windfall figures will be included in the draft report to reflect changes in figures since last years original SHLAA. | CD |
| | | |
| 6 | Next steps | |
| 6.1 | Draft report will be produced, taking into consideration comments from this Steering Group meeting. | CD/SJ |
| 6.2 | Draft report will be discussed at a further Steering Group meeting to be arranged. | |
| | | |