CLIVE PARISH MEETING
Thursday 3 January 2019 at 7.30pm in Clive Village Hall

MINUTES

Present: Chairman of the Parish Council, Cllr Bentham. Parish Clerk: Lydia Bardsley, minute taker.
Speakers: Eddie West – Shropshire Council, Principal Planning Officer
Members of the public – 46
The meeting commenced at 7.30pm.

12/18 The Vice Chairman of the Parish Council, Cllr Jinks welcomed all present and thanked Eddie West for coming to Clive to talk to us all.

13/18 **Apologies for absence – Cllr Peter Walters**

14/18 **Update on Shropshire Council Local Plan Review** by Eddie West, Principal Planning Officer for Shropshire Council
Followed by **Public Forum**

Eddie West gave a presentation on the Preferred Sites consultation stage of the Local Plan Review.

Eddie has already done a round of these events around the county in the Place Plan areas e.g. there was already a meeting in Wem, but as none of the Councillors could attend, he has come to present specifically for Clive tonight. He will be talking about what Shropshire Council is proposing for Clive, but also the wider context of what is important for Shropshire county overall.

He explained that Shropshire Council has a statutory duty to review the Local Plan regularly. The current Local Plan is SAMDev which goes up to 2026. The national agenda is changing, and household projections are changing, and as a result there are things Shropshire Council has to do by law to reflect these changes e.g. producing an updated plan. There are consequences in terms of planning if the council doesn't do this. One of the most important aspects is that Shropshire has to maintain a 5 year housing land supply. If they can't do that, there are important consequences on how Shropshire Council makes planning decisions. Effectively it is to ensure the council can keep in control of decision-making in the area.

Time-frames:
Shropshire is still in preamble stage, proposing things, and they are asking for opinions locally, but not just residents, but also infrastructure providers, developers, landowners, Clinical Commissioning Group, etc.

Preferred scale and distribution of development consultation (how much development in Shropshire in general) – end 2017
Preferred sites consultation – began end 2018. What it means for individual settlements, housing numbers etc. This stage is still very much a consultation.
Expected Final Plan – **hopefully by late 2019.** This will be what Shropshire Council thinks is the right plan for Shropshire.
Independent examination of Plan by government – 2020. The planning inspectorate will examine the Local Plan and will always make amendments.
Adoption of updated plan - Expected towards end of 2020.

Eddie West emphasised that this is not something being thrust upon residents; it is a proper engagement process, and Shropshire Council want to hear residents' views. This should bring some comfort to residents.

Context: Shropshire's growth.
Shropshire has to meet the Housing Need. To discover this we use a methodology handed down by government – approx. 25000 homes in Shropshire overall is the minimum goal. If they don't meet that Shropshire will be in trouble. The goal is to aim a bit higher (approx. 15%) and they consulted on that end of 2017. This gives a figure of 28750 between 2016 and 2036. Already roughly 18500 houses already accounted for (built or committed).

10250 is roughly the residual amount identified as new sites in Shropshire. This is what needs to be found.

Signed …….. Date……..

Employment growth is also important for context, which need to be balanced with housing levels. Shropshire Council is taking an urban approach, looking to develop slightly more housing in main urban areas, e.g. Shrewsbury, Whitchurch, Market Drayton, Wem, Bridgnorth, Ludlow, and Oswestry in particular.

Tonight – Shropshire is asking your opinion on hierarchy of areas, towns, villages, settlements.
Shrewsbury is at the top of the tree, taking about 30% of housing and Town Council is fairly supportive of that.

Principle Centres in this part of the world are Whitchurch and Market Drayton.
Key centre here – Wem
Community Hubs and Community Clusters – that's the rural areas
Shropshire Council has identified a list of Community Hubs. Clive is being proposed as Community Hub, it isn't a Hub at the moment, in the current Local Plan it is classed as Open Countryside. Shropshire Council is asking your opinion on that.

Shropshire Council has identified its preferred options for sites, and for the overall amount of growth for Community Hubs.

In the Wem Place Plan area, the key centre is Wem, and the Community Hubs in this Place Plan area are Clive, Hadnall, and Shawbury. The Community Clusters are the next level down on the hierarchy, smaller settlements that can take some infill development e.g. Grinshill, Harmer Hill, etc.

Community Hub - what it really means is that Shropshire Council thinks Clive and other Community Hubs are sustainable villages. There are 39 identified Community Hubs being proposed across Shropshire in this consultation process. Prees is one example, several in the Oswestry rural area as well. Basically it means Shropshire thinks Clive is sustainable, it has services to maintain a moderate increase in housing numbers over the 20 year period (up to 2036).

An important point to remember is that Shropshire recognises that not all hubs are the same, and this has an impact on what the level of growth being proposed in each Community Hub. Bayston Hill is a much larger settlement, it is the largest village in the county, which clearly has implications for what that means for that particular village.

How has Shropshire identified those 39 villages? They have taken a consistent methodology throughout the county. This is important from a planning perspective, as we have to make sure that the things Shropshire says and the settlement hierarchy that will be proposed to the Planning Inspectorate has its basis in evidence, e.g. hierarchy of villages.

The way Shropshire has done that, is to look at the levels of services and facilities in those areas e.g. GP, primary school, convenience store, community hall etc.
Secondary services – supermarket, secondary school, library, leisure centre, play area, community green space.

Broadband and local employment opportunities are also important factors.
Shropshire Council has looked at every single village in Shropshire and has scored each village according to whether it has these facilities, each of which has its own score, e.g. outdoor leisure facility = 3 points.

Clive – 54 points (threshold is 48 points), and this is what Shropshire Council thinks there is in Clive. Bear in mind that several facilities can be housed in a single facility e.g. Shop and post office in one building. They have consulted on this before, and Shropshire Council thinks they are correct, but they know that things change, e.g. shop has been sold.
If Shropshire Council has got it wrong, they need to know, but we have consulted before on the principle of using this approach to identify which settlements should and shouldn't be Community Hubs.

To clarify, scoring for a library includes mobile libraries. That has caused some concern locally, but it's important to remember that the County Council has taken a consistent approach across whole county, e.g. a mobile library will score 3 points here and every else in county. It is not really the methodology we are concerned about now, but the factual input going into the methodology.

About 4 months ago Myddle was proposed as Community Hub. Then the shop closed, so they dipped under the 48 point threshold and they came out of the process for being a Community Hub.

Cllr Jinks: To clarify, the Parish Council has had 2 meetings with Shropshire Council about this points scoring system, everything has been discussed and clarified. There were even some things that have been taken out that were incorrect.

Signed …….. Date……..

Eddie West (cont): As it stands Clive scores 54 points. The 48 point threshold is felt to be natural cut off point. The Planning Authority thinks the methodology works well. Shropshire Council understands there will be some elements which raise eyebrows, but the consistent approach is an important thing to remember.

What does Community Hub status mean in terms of figures for Clive? Over 20 years, they are proposing 40 houses for Clive, which is a relatively moderate housing number compared to Shawbury (150 houses) and Hadnall (125 houses), and in Clive this amounts to roughly 2 houses a year on average. There have been no buildings since 2016 but there are 2 commitments, so Shropshire Council needs to find space for 38 houses.

They propose to allocate a site to support the delivery of that housing figure, and a small proportion of windfall development, e.g. infill development. For those unfamiliar with the term**, infill development is 2- 3houses within the built area, with development on either side, with a frontage on to the road.**

The proposed housing figure is based on:
- Population of village
- Level of services and facilities
- Development opportunities and site options
- Consultation responses

Number is at lower end of other proposed Community Hubs in Shropshire. Only one settlement which is lower (Bicton, outside Shrewsbury) has a guideline of 25-30.

In Clive it would be approximately 20% increase in housing over 20 years.

Site options:
Please treat site option maps being circulated with caution – they are sites that have been proposed by landowners and have been considered by Shropshire Council, nothing more than that. **None** of these site options have any planning merit, or status, at this stage, not even those highlighted on the map (CLV010, CLV017 etc.) This is still very early on in the consultation process.

CLV010 on western edge of village was identified by Shropshire Council as one sustainable option for village, with access from Station Road, with 20-25 houses. Actively being promoted by landowner, it is the site option that Shropshire Council is consulting on at the moment. Clive Parish Council has had discussions about the site options, and there have been initial concerns and wanting to open up other potential options on the table.

Other main contender would be development at the other end of the village, sites CLV017, CLV013, and potentially CLV018. **This option would be an alternative to CLV010 not in addition to CLV010**.

There has been a very in depth methodology to assess the suitability of the sites. The County Council then whittles this down to a more moderate number, looking at factors like risk factors e.g. flood zones, open space, can you get safe access to the site, etc. Highways think they can get safe access into CLV010 via Station Road not Field Drive (there is a ransom strip there). The specific access point would be assessed and subject to a planning application and decided at later stage.

Shropshire Council felt CLV010 was a more sustainable location for development, as it was believed to be closer to the heart of village, closer to the built up area, within walking distance of the facilities and services, etc. Some residents voiced their disagreement with this argument, but it was agreed to save specific comments until after the presentation.

As an aside, Eddie West made the point that he was aware that development was not well-liked by some people, but that everybody lives in houses that once weren't there.

In terms of the choice of sites options, the Planning authority is prepared to listen to the views of individuals and the Parish Council, and the authority has the ability to make changes. All things being equal, there is not much difference between various sites on the map, so it comes down to a professional judgement call. In terms of the option on the Eastern side of the village, CLV017, it has been through the assessment process, and no significant issues were identified. Residents are entitled to say if they think the preferred option (CLV010) is not the best option. Whether you agree or disagree with Shropshire Council, they will listen, because both those options can be credible.

Some other options are less credible e.g. down Wem road, the area near the Railway Inn pub, as well as some of the larger sites to the north of the village, that Shropshire Council do not consider appropriate in the context of village.

Signed …….. Date……..

Because of the amount of land available on CLV010 site, Shropshire Council thinks you could develop a low density housing option in keeping with character of village. One of the issues with the sites on the eastern area, is there might be an element of cramming, and they might need more windfall development over the course of the 20 years to meet the housing need. This is one of the reasons why CLV010 is the preferred option for Shropshire Council, but Eddie West reiterated that Shropshire Council is listening. This is a consultation, and he wouldn't be here if it was a tick box exercise.

He also mentioned that the evidence based documents can be found on the consultation website if anyone is interested, which includes evidence for why Clive has been identified as a Hub in the first place.

Shropshire Council is also consulting on how they deliver **affordable housing** in the county. Affordable housing is a challenge to the Council, e.g. availability of land, economics of the process, public perception of affordable housing, willingness of landowners to release land at a lower rate.
Policy currently potentially allows for rural exception scheme sites in Clive (these would be for 100% affordable housing) if there is a need. Shropshire Council feels this scheme is not currently working as well as it could do, and they want to incentivise landowners to part with their land. This is the **cross –subsidy policy,** which if it goes through, **will allow an element of open market housing mixed with affordable housing to make the scheme more economical.** The cross-subsidy policy if approved could see the council moving to a percentage split of perhaps 25% open market, 75% affordable housing, but that will be based on open book accounting.

The consultation ends 31st Jan, but it may be extended by a week possibly, but this will be confirmed in the next week.

The message is clear. Shropshire Council is planning for growth. If you don't plan for growth effectively it will happen where you don't want it. It's a very broad message but it's true. Shropshire Council has used a consistent approach to help with planning for growth effectively, but we are asking your opinions, and they will be listened to.

Cllr Jinks: Thank you Eddie for your presentation. As it stands we are Open Countryside. Shropshire Council's proposal is for Clive to be a Community Hub. If we adopt the proposal to be a Community Hub, there will be designated areas for develop over the next 20 years that we can influence as a community, because we're involved in the consultation process. **<u>If we stay as Open Countryside, what would the implications be?</u>**
EW: If Shropshire Council has got it drastically wrong and Clive remains as Open Countryside, then in general open market housing would be resisted, unless Clive opted in as a Community Cluster, which you may want to do. Clive wouldn't then be eligible for infill open market development, what you might be eligible for is affordable housing. This is because of the ever growing need for Affordable Housing. **In general, open market, infill development will be resisted by policy in areas classed as Open Countryside**.

JJ: The feeling is, we can either work against Shropshire Council and dig our heels in, and say we wish to remain as we are. Keep in mind there have been just over 20 houses built over the last 20 years in Clive anyway. In those cases, whether we like it or not, as a Parish Council, we have very little influence over those developments. We can object to planning applications, but ultimately the decision is taken by the Planning Authority (Shropshire Council).
If we embrace the Community Hub proposal, we have more input into those choices. We can only influence, we can't control, and the final decisions are made by planners. We as a council are interested to know the feelings of the residents – do we want to stay as we are, and accept uncontrolled infill development, or do we want to have influence over the next twenty years, as to what we see, where it goes, and how it's controlled?

At the meeting parish councillors had at Shirehall, as a group of councillors, we all felt that CLV010 was inappropriate as the preferred choice, we felt it was the wrong end of the village. There is the issue of density on the eastern side of the village, but this could be controlled by extending into other sites. It is best not to focus too much on discussions of specific sites at this point though, as the proposal for Community Hub status is the main question here.

Cllr Jinks opened the floor to discussion:

<u>What if the shop closes?</u>
It was clarified that if the shop was to close during this process (i.e. up until the final plan is submitted to the inspectorate towards the end of this year), then Clive would fall out of Community Hub status. Shropshire Council has to live by the consistent methodology they have adopted. If Clive drops below the 48 point threshold then the village would simply not be a Community Hub. But it was cautioned that the idea of voluntarily losing a facility in order to be saved from development was an unhealthy attitude to take.

Signed …….. Date……..

What are the options for opting into a cluster with Grinshill?
EW: Grinshill are very keen to be a cluster, if Clive fell beneath the Community Hub threshold. If Clive remains as a Community Hub, Grinshill would be eager to be a Community Cluster in their own right, because they recognise they want infill development and shared services. Wouldn't really affect Clive's status. **Only** if Clive opted in as a Community Cluster (potentially with Grinshill) would open market infill development **potentially** be permitted.

If the village accepts the proposals, would the Planning Authority be able to help protect a service under threat (e.g. shop or Doctors' surgery) from certain planning applications e.g. shutting shop, change of use etc.
EW: Unfortunately it doesn't really work like that in planning, as every planning decision is made on its own merits. Under the Local Plan there are existing policies, that don't specifically protect services, but they are taken into account particularly where there is the last shop or last service in a village. This is certainly one of the things we will be consulting on later this year, a suite of development management policies (not sites, or locations) but the policies that planning officers use in making decisions and what those issues could be in bolstering the protection of services in Community Hubs. We are not consulting on that right now, but it is a good point raised.

Is site Yorton 002 one of the considered areas for Clive?
EW: This is not within the village boundary so it dropped out of considerations fairly early on. It is felt it was divorced from Clive. It has been considered as an option for Yorton but not Clive; it just happens that it appears on the Clive options map because of the scale of the map we've used. We wouldn't develop that site in Yorton anyway because Yorton is not being proposed as a Community Hub, so that option is effectively off the table. Shropshire Council makes a distinction between Parish and village boundaries, so the development near Yorton station also does not count towards the Clive growth target of 40 houses. The point was raised that people in Yorton make use of services in Clive.

Once a site has been allocated e.g. CLV010, how would that impact future applications?
If CLV010 was allocated that would form part of the development boundary, as per the boundary map being proposed, which is also being consulted on. Any land outside that boundary would be classed as Open Countryside. In policy terms, unless the proposal for land outside the boundary was for an affordable housing scheme or a cross-subsidy affordable housing development, then it would be against policy, so it would most likely be refused.

Transport links scores?
EW: It's mostly to do with public transport i.e. bus services provision, rather than rail, so Yorton station is not really considered here.

Will bus service subsidies continue until 2036?
The point was raised that residents are being asked to look forward and get behind this consultation when the very services that contribute towards the Community Hub point threshold could be taken away by the same people who have proposed Clive being made into a Community Hub in the first place.
EW: We hope it will be, but there is no guarantee of this. If the bus services were taken away during the consultation then Clive would drop below the points threshold, but it's important to remember that we are consulting based on the information we have at a fixed moment in time (like for the village shop), and we need a consistent approach. This is the same situation in all settlements across the county.

Hadnall and Shawbury have very good infrastructure for transport, Clive's is very poor. Will there be any improvement in our roads?
EW: Clive clearly is not the same as these other settlements. All are being proposed as Community Hubs, but it's important to make the distinction between bigger and smaller settlements and what that means for growth potential in each case. Our intention is not to ruin villages, but to help them grow sustainably, which is why we have proposed moderate growth for Clive purposely. It would be wrong of us to apply a one size fits all approach. Potentially road improvements can come off the back of housing development. Development pays for things and it is one of the benefits of development.

Concerns were raised over additional vehicles (approximately 80-120 cars) and potentially dangerous traffic levels on single track lanes with narrow passing points.
EW: This is why we have proposed a relatively moderate level of growth, but if you disagree that is why we are asking your opinions in this consultation process.

How are you going to get access onto CLV010 site? We live next to that site and had to move our drive because it's considered so dangerous on that corner.

Signed …….. Date……..

EW: Like all the other sites, this one has been through an assessment process, and bear in mind that a development of 20+ houses there would pay for things to improve. Drainage concerns around that site are something we would have to discuss with utilities companies.

Cllr Bryant-Griffiths raised a question on the village boundary map.
EW: We are consulting on the Clive village boundary as well, the current proposed boundary map only includes the preferred option CLV010 and not the sites on the eastern side of the village, but if there was enough evidence and argument for it, then we could change the preferred boundary to include those alternative preferred sites instead of going around site CLV010.

This is why it is so important we have this process to get your opinions. Some views we will not consider appropriate, some we will. It's not a case of who shouts the loudest, but the points and issues that are raised. If there are very good reasons why you think the preferred option CLV010 is not appropriate, and there are better options, this is the absolutely time to tell us.

Regardless of which site is eventually allocated, what influence do we have in the planning process? In terms of the nature, type, size of housing, whether it is affordable or open market?
EW: The general view in Shropshire is that the new houses that are being developed are not necessarily meeting local needs, they are too big. One of our jobs is to work with the development industry. We have told them there is a greater need for affordable housing. We will be drafting up and consulting on the policies that will guide that, in around May/June this year. These policies will include design and type of housing etc., and will be aiming to match the needs of local communities with the aspirations of the development industry. Shropshire Council does quite well at building affordable housing, we do quite well at building executive houses, but what we don't do so well at is the middle ground, i.e. £200,000 houses. Two things will change that: Firstly, policies, i.e. developers would only get permission if they included a high proportion of 2-3 bedroom houses open to family housing. The second thing that will change that is the market. We are not really talking about this level of detail in this current consultation, but please do use this consultation to raise those points.

Neighbourhood plan process.
Eddie West explained what a Neighbourhood Plan is.
EW: It is a statutory part of the development plan process for the area. In practice, this means you will go through a process similar to what Shropshire Council is doing now, but in a more localised area, and led by but not run by the Parish Council through a Neighbourhood Plan group, who will guide the development of the Neighbourhood Plan. This can be a number of things: a document which sets out the level of growth for the area, allocations for the area, or it can say Shropshire Council will take care of those things, and the local community will take care of what type of housing we want e.g. affordable, family homes etc.

It is a much more rigorous process, than what you might be used to in Parish Council planning. It relies on evidence, e.g. if you want a policy for housing need, you'd need a housing needs survey. Much in the way that Shropshire Council is being examined on its Local Plan in 2020, your local Neighbourhood Plan will also be examined. A large part of it will be doing surveys, producing evidence, defining what you want from the plan, and producing planning policies, e.g. development here shall only be considered if conditions x, y, and z are met.

The Neighbourhood Plan is then submitted to Shropshire Council, who appoints an examiner, and it then goes to be examined. We've just been through that process with two settlements (Market Drayton and Woore). Woore did a plan which took them about 2 years. Would have been identified as Community Hub, and they are still being proposed as Community Hub, but because they have done the Neighbourhood Plan two years ago, they are able to identify the housing number, and how that growth is produced. Market Drayton did the same on a much larger scale.

Be under no illusion, it is a rigorous process, and the emphasis is on the evidence base. Market Drayton Neighbourhood Plan has been 3 years in the making, and it has been a very expensive process. The examiner rejected the first plan as there was not enough evidence to support the Plan. This is unusual, but not wholly unexpected. In Woore there were some fairly significant changes made by the examiner to their preferred plan due to evidence base. That plan will go to a referendum, and if 50% of residents say they like it, it is adopted, and then is used in the planning application processes. The Neighbourhood Plan is then part of the development plan and has more weight in the decision making process.

Cllr Jinks: Clive Parish Council thinks there is a necessity for a Neighbourhood Plan in the village. It will take time and money, and funding will be looked into. But a Neighbourhood Plan will not have an impact on this consultation, so it will not be in place before the end of the consultation.
EW: Condover and Pontesbury are doing a Neighbourhood Plan, and they can be very specific, but in the future, it would be the local community who would be defending their Plan and fighting landowners who

Signed …….. Date……..

wanted their land to be part of that plan. Shropshire Council would be taking a back seat at that point.

At the moment Shropshire Council are all ears. We think Clive should be a Community Hub, we think the numbers are right, but we are prepared to say there are other options for site allocations to consider, and there is time to do that. We don't think there is any need to increase that figure of 40.

Previously development has been sympathetic in small pockets over the last 18 years. But large sites look like estates, which is out of keeping with the feel of the village. There are also concerns about access bottlenecks. If we divided up the housing figure across the village it would be more sympathetic to the village overall.

EW: We have to show deliverable options. If the allocations that we proposed are too small, landowners might not think it is worth their while, but that opinion is a useful one to consider.

Where are the third and fourth options? Which other sites meet criteria more or less?
EW: Sometimes it is better to have development in just one area to contain the impact in one space over a shorter period of time. There are significant constraints with a lot of the other options in Clive. Those two options that book-end the village are certainly more appropriate than others. One is not considerably better than the other. Our professional judgement is that CLV010 was better, but we don't live here, you do.
The gap between CLV012 and CLV18 would work quite well if it was promoted, but at this point we can't consider that gap as the landowner hasn't put it forward. We would definitely have a rethink in terms of scale of development if it did come forward.

What about visual impact?
Residents raised the following concerns: For those that live near CLV010 it would be looking out over a large development, and would devalue our houses. There are also far more people who would be affected by any development at the western side of the village.
EW: There are two important principles to remember in planning. People don't have a right to a view, and the effect on the value of existing houses is not a material consideration.

Visual impact assessments have been done however. Technicians look at parcels of land, what is the character e.g. rolling landscape, pastoral, etc., and how sensitive that area is to change. Each parcel is then given a score of low, medium, or high sensitivity. It doesn't mean you can't get development next to it, but it might mean there are better options elsewhere. Especially if you are looking at sites on the periphery of a village. All sites around Clive have roughly the same score in terms of sensitivity.

The land at CLV010 is higher and slopes down towards the road, what about drainage onto lower level properties?
Cllr Bryant-Griffiths explained there is a drain outside that field that regularly drains onto the road, and other residents mentioned the personal expense of having the land drained and that kerb stones have eroded due to the run-off.

The general consensus seems to be that people prefer site allocations on the eastern end of village (if the Parish Council were to adopt the Community Hub and work with the County Council).

Cllr Jinks: It's worth bearing in mind that landowners have promoted their land themselves; they have not been approached by developers. If we embrace the Community Hub we can have a bit more say in the process. The idea of this meeting is to gather your feedback, and to encourage you to email the clerk with feedback (responding to the specific consultation questions). The Parish Council will then discuss the feedback at the next committee meeting on 10th January, and draft a response. Clive Parish Council can then put forward to Shropshire Council what we see as the village's opinion in terms of what it wants or doesn't want. I personally (as an individual, not a councillor) believe we will lose the opportunity to influence the decision if we fight the Community Hub status. I personally believe that we will be a Community Hub regardless of what is said tonight (that's not the Council's opinion, just mine).

What is the stance on the shop?
JJ: It is open now. If it closes next week then we will not be a Hub. But that is a commercial concern. This is complete hearsay, but we understand that the building has been sold, but the owner is staying on until the new owner finds someone to come in and run it. We don't have a choice except to make a decision as a Parish Council based on the information we have and where we stand at this moment in time. We can't make a decision based on what ***might*** happen to the shop in the future.

EW: Whilst this stage of the consultation ends 31st January, if something significant happens with the shop etc., in March/April, please tell us.

Signed …….. Date……..

There was a quick (non-binding) show of hands comparing support for Community Hub status or staying as Open Countryside, which seemed to be marginally more in favour of staying as Open Countryside.

EW: If people prefer the middle ground of trying to be a cluster with Grinshill, even though that option is not currently being considered, it is worth saying that in your responses.

There was another quick show of hands, and more people were in favour of being a Community Cluster.
EW: What being a Cluster means is that you wouldn't have a development boundary, you would have no site allocations, which means you would be open to infill development in the main built up area, and you wouldn't get a housing figure. There would be no housing figure cap, but it would be naturally capped as development could only be infill.

Whether you are Open Countryside, a Cluster, or a Community Hub, there is an **option on the table** for **Rural Exception Schemes on the edge of the village** (if there is a local need for Affordable Housing) and policy could allow for this to happen. **So being a Cluster or open Countryside doesn't mean that there will be no development.**

Can we clarify whether Community Hub, Open Countryside, or Community Cluster gives us more influence over what kind growth we'd have?
EW:
Community Hub – Shropshire Council gives you a boundary. Inside the boundary is the Hub, outside the boundary is Open Countryside. Open Market housing would be resisted outside that Hub boundary, and we would give you a Housing number as well.
Open Countryside – there is no boundary, no opportunity for open market infill development. You might get a landowner putting forward land for affordable housing, and could have a mix of open market and affordable. Applications will be judged on merits and local housing need.
Community Cluster – This is the middle ground. There would be no boundary, and no site allocations. Development would be infill only, but you might get cross-subsidy development for affordable housing.

I would say the Local Plan process will give you an element of control in any case. If we're wrong in assessment of Clive as a Community Hub and Clive drops below threshold, you have the option of opting in as a Community Cluster.

Services capacity e.g. School and GP
We have this score (of 54) because of the amenities we have but those amenities (e.g. School and GP) couldn't accommodate all the extra people from this extra housing e.g. 80-120 children. The school is tiny and being used by the surrounding areas, which are also getting extra housing.
EW: The Education Department tells us that there are on average 18 children per 100 houses, but this could change if it's predominantly family housing being built, but it's never as many children as you think.

In terms of the GP surgery, we speak to the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) as part of the consultation to discuss what the County needs from them in terms of infrastructure.
JJ: Part of the problem with the GP surgery is that Clive also services the greater part of Wem, Shawbury, and Hadnall. If Shropshire Council is doubling size of Hadnall, why aren't they adding a medical centre?

EW: We also have to have an infrastructure plan alongside our housing plan when we submit the Local Plan to government, so we do consider these things. There is often a local perception of an issue, that isn't really an issue in practice, but that might not be the case here. Quite often the CCG say it is not an issue of capacity, but how a GP surgery works, e.g. hours worked etc. It's not always a case of needing more space.

Cllr Jinks thanked everyone for coming to the meeting and reminded them to email the clerk with their responses to the consultation questions, and importantly whether they prefer Open Countryside, Community Cluster, or Community Hub, and if the latter, which end of the village they would prefer site allocations.

Cllr Jinks also thanked Eddie West for coming to the meeting and answering our questions.

15/18 **Next Parish meeting: Annual Parish Meeting 16th May 2019**

Meeting closed: 9.38 pm.

Signed …….. Date……..