**NOTES OF CONDOVER PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP HELD ON**

**25th OCTOBER 2018 AT CONDOVER VILLAGE HALL**

**Present:** J Jackson, C Machin, E Marvin (Chair), K Harris and P Gore

 B Carey (Consultant)

1. **Welcome and Apologies**

E Marvin welcomed people to the meeting. Apologies had been received from

S Mackay, S King, B Gill, S Peters, S Gill and R Morris. M Mead (Shropshire Council) had been invited but did not attend

E Marvin informed the Group that he had recently met someone (on holiday) from Pusey Parish Council, which has a Neighbourhood Plan. They shared respective experiences of developing a Neighbourhood Plan, the relationship with the local authority and holding referenda. Pusey PC had held two referenda, the second of which reduced the number of new houses and better engaged with the community in lively debate. Overall however, the person from Pusey PC was very encouraging about the importance and value of having a Neighbourhood Plan. E Marvin confirmed his view that Condover PC should carry on with a Neighbourhood Plan, and also that more people should be included in the Steering Group, to enhance community participation.

1. **Feedback from community survey**

**2.1** B Carey provided a spreadsheet collating the responses to the community survey. There had to date been 206 completed responses and 7 blank responses: a response rate of 23.5%. It was agreed this was a little low, however some more completed surveys were still be added. It was agreed to include the blank returns in with the overall count as they probably represented the opinion of those who returned them.

**2.2** It was further agreed that the Neighbourhood Plan was a more complex document and that more community engagement was required to enable residents to feel more in involved and the process more accessible.

**2.3** The spreadsheet of responses would be shared with the Parish Council at its meeting on 6th November, along with the analysis. The surveys were currently being analysed and a report would be ready around 2 November 2018.

1. **Update from Shropshire Council**

**3.1** M Mead from Shropshire Council was not in attendance.

**3.2** E Marvin reported that he along with D Lane and P Gore had met with Shropshire Council to discuss site allocations and CIL, which had been reported back from at the previous Group meeting. They had subsequently met with Gemma Davies (Head of Economic Growth) at Shropshire Council to discuss CIL, however this meeting was productive only in so far as it was confirmed that with a Neighbourhood Plan the annual Neighbourhood Fund payment would increase by 10%

**3.3** It had been confirmed that the Local Plan Review will continue to seek to articulate the Shropshire Council strategic plan, to focus development in Shrewsbury and the market towns. Shropshire Council presented the view that site allocation in parish areas was less of a concern: it was anticipate around 60 new houses would be delivered in Dorrington, and around 50 – 60 in Condover (as a development hub)

1. **Consultation with businesses and young people**

**4.1** E Marvin referred to the summary of responses fromLocal Business Analysis undertaken for the Parish Plan. This highlighted a number of key themes:

* A mixed response about the need, if any, for more apprenticeship opportunities
* A very mixed response to environmental issues, which appeared to related largely to the nature of the business responding
* Some businesses gave community support and involvement a relatively high priority while for others this was less of a concern
* Public transport was not identified as a concern. Roads were a concern for many, especially in winter and when used by large, or speeding vehicles
* Equal numbers said housing, heritage and local services were important to them

**4.2** There followed general discussion about possible current infrastructure priorities for local businesses, including broadband, logistics and distribution networks, recruitment and retention, business sustainability and growth, and business support services. The potential value of establishing a rural business hub in the Parish was debated.

**4.3** It was agreed it was potentially quite difficult to engage with local businesses, especially as they were so diverse and dispersed across a wide rural area. A questionnaire would probably prove ineffective. It was agreed:

* E Marvin would raise the question of how best to consult with local businesses at the next Dorrington Business Network meeting
* B Carey would research how best to consult with rural businesses and report back to the next Group meeting
* B Carey would draft a series of questions for local businesses to be discussed at the next meeting

**4.4** E Marvin referred to the summary of responses fromthe consultation undertaken with young people (primary schools) for the Parish Plan. This highlighted a number of key themes:

* The majority of young people liked where they lived and enjoyed living in the Parish, mainly because of family, friends and school
* When asked what they didn’t like about living where they did, the majority reported slow internet, speeding lorries, friends living far away and ‘it’s boring’
* Half travelled by car, a quarter walked, a fifth used a bus or taxi
* Cycling was considered by most to be dangerous
* Hobbies – a third enjoyed playing and watching sport, a quarter enjoyed computer games. A tenth liked music and organised youth clubs. There was a list of things young people would like to do but that that they thought weren’t available in the Parish

**4.5** Following discussion, it was agreed the preference for the Neighbourhood Plan would be to consult with older young people and young adults, however it was unclear how best to do this in the absence of secondary and tertiary education in the Parish. It was estimated around 50 – 60 young people attended Church Stretton school and 50 – 60 attended 6th form college/SCAT in Shrewsbury (to be explored further).

**4.6** The focus of consultation with young people was discussed, including their priorities over the next 20 years and what may encourage or enable them to remain in the Parish area, for example: availability of/desire for local apprenticeships vs university, entrepreneurship, development of life skills, provision of youth hubs and more meeting places.

**4.7** E Marvin suggested engaging young people around issues they are directly interested in such as the environment and/or plastic use, recycling, buying local and so on. This was considered a good idea

**4.8** It was agreed:

* B Carey would research how best to consult with young people in rural communities and report back to the next Group meeting
* B Carey would draft a series of questions for young people to be discussed at the next meeting
1. **Next Steps and Action Plan**

**5.1** The actions to progress consultation with business and young people were noted

**5.2** B Carey would update the Project Plan timetable. The Project Plan timetable would become a standard agenda item to be reviewed and updated as required at each meeting.

1. **Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be held at 7.30pm 21st November 2018 at Condover Village Hall.

**DONM now 7.30pm 22nd November 2018 at Condover Village Hall.**