

**Site A – Land adjacent Village Hall Car Park**

	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
1.	Concern that overflow car park to Village Hall will be lost and will need to be re-provided	The overflow car park is not proposed to be part of the development plan and will be retained for visitors to the Village Hall.
2.	Concern over access to the site considering current access road to village hall, although recognition that the site has good visual access.	It is likely that one main entrance/exit point will serve the village hall and the development. An agreement between the land owners and the developer will need to be reached to achieve the retention of a single access point which appears to be desired by all parties rather than adding an access point for a development. Any new or altered vehicular access onto the A48 would need to meet with GCC approval in accordance with Street Design Code.
3.	Concern for the increase in traffic onto A48 so near the school – reduce speed limit, insert pedestrian crossing.	The number of properties should remain minimal and so the impact on traffic is not considered to be excessive. The County Council will be able to provide a better assessment of the impact once a proposal is put forward for development.
4.	A roundabout be put onto the A48 to access the site, Village Hall and Bury Lane	At present there are no considerations being given to changing the current road layout and speed limit. However a new development will require an assessment of the road. It appears that residents are positive about improvements to the access to the Village Hall.
5.	Size and nature of scheme – some residents may be unhappy with large numbers of new homes.	The number of homes will be based on the number needed for Minsterworth. This event allowed residents to express their views. No proposals have been made at this time.
6.	The site will bring the Hall and land into the village more and make improvements to access and parking, however concern over the increase in number of vehicular movements in this particular part of the village.	Suggestions regarding the need for a post office and shop in the village were considerable and there could be an option to create a 'Village Centre' and build on the sustainability of Minsterworth and enable 'community life' to continue. Consideration will need to be given to any increase in traffic movements.
7.	This site will have less impact on neighbours and minimal drainage concerns.	Ensuring the character of Minsterworth remains is essential in any new development proposal. We appreciate resident's local knowledge on drainage.
8.	Affordable housing is seen as a positive for the village and housing people of all ages appears to be desired.	The idea of the event was to get a feel for what the community's needs and wants in terms of new homes and so the information about bungalows was very much welcomed. This response reflects some of the findings from the parish housing need survey undertaken by GRCC in 2011. We can use this information to support any scheme designs.
9.	Good access to school, church and bus stop and possible public footpaths around the land.	It is imperative that a rural development is seen as a positive view from existing residents and local knowledge is invaluable to help in the design of a new development of any size.
10.	Concerns that even a small development will lead to much more (large numbers) of development in Minsterworth.	At present we are concentrating on the small numbers of residents with an affordable housing need. We are unable to comment on the future development of an area as this is not in our gift.
11.	Concern that local people would not get first consideration.	Rural exception schemes are to provide affordable housing for local people and so the homes would have a legal requirement to be rented/owned by people with a local connection to Minsterworth in the first instance.
12.	Comments indicated that the residents of	Creating a well-balanced community is high on the agenda for

	a new development would be well involved in village life if this site was to go ahead.	new homes in the village.
13.	It was welcomed that improvements to access and parking at the village hall is likely to encourage parents to use the facility when dropping off and picking up children from the school.	Local knowledge about the impact of the school and volume of traffic in this area of the village will be essential in designing the layout.
14.	Concern that the village hall land and car parking is land in trust and no consultation has taken place regarding ownership and use of land.	It is suggested that the Parish Council work with residents and land owners in order to agree the use of and changes to the land that are likely to be required.
15.	Concern that shared access is not acceptable due to numbers and types of vehicles using the land at particular times.	An assessment of the use of the access point would be suggested in order for the Parish Council and land owners to understand the potential impact of additional vehicle use and that the option of widening the access point is likely to be required.
16.	If Site A proceeded: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Would there be compensation for football club during building works</li> <li>2. Consideration must be given to all movements around the area (i.e. school drop-off/pick-up)</li> <li>3. Pollution details should be obtained</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Such detail would need to be worked out between land owners/users and developer.</li> <li>2. This would be part of the considerations and assessment of the site</li> <li>3. As above</li> </ol>

**Site B – Land at Calcots Green**

	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
1.	Concern that this much larger parcel of land has the potential for future over development.	It is believed that only part of the land is required and suitable for development. Also, legal covenants could be put in place to prevent the development of part of the land.
2.	Concern that developing this land would have a significant impact on sewerage, traffic, noise, flooding and draining issues and so on.	Local knowledge of the land, having no mains drainage, use of the roads and so on is invaluable information for all parties to be aware of in order to agree whether this site would be pursued or discounted from the possible site options.
3.	Access via Church Lane is seen as not suitable due to the nature of the road being a single track, country lane, increasing vehicle use including farm vehicles and that at some point traffic meets the A48 at poor points in the road. Upgrading the road is desired.	It is felt that with a small number of homes the impact is not great, however it is acknowledged that Church lane/ Calcots Green may be unsuitable even for current usage. Making improvements to roads as part of a rural scheme increases the costs and often means that development does not go ahead. As with Site A an assessment of the road and access would be essential in order to understand the implications and also the costs associated with any improvements to the existing road.
4.	Some support for the site, consideration however should be to develop the higher ground and retain the rural character of the road	As above, it is believed that only part of the land is suitable for development and these support the argument for it be on higher ground. Design would be carefully considered.
5.	Concern over impact on near-by homes	If this site was to be pursued, residents would be consulted on design and layout and the impact on neighbouring homes we be a key consideration.

**General comments**

1.	There are many other sites that could be more suitable, why are these not being considered and why did we not see a map with them all identified?	Over time sites have been dismissed due to many issues from road safety, poor access and visibility points of the land, flooding and so on. It was felt by the Parish Council, GRCC and TBC that we should present the more sound options to residents.
2.	Concerns over affordability, house prices, council tax and so on.	The homes for a rural exception site must be led by an affordable housing need where residents are unable to meet their housing needs in the open market. Rural exception sites are delivered in this particular way to ensure home owners and rented occupiers can afford to live in the village.
3.	Support for affordable housing in Minsterworth as an opportunity to provide much needed homes. Many comments regarding dwelling types – bungalows and houses.	The information provided is most valuable to all parties in considering a scheme and we will take this forward.
4.	Road safety ('dangerous road'), traffic and use of rat-runs leading to the A48 and congestion is a high priority for residents of Minsterworth	As previously stated such issues will be fundamental in considering a scheme.
5.	Infrastructure (no mains drainage in Minsterworth)	As previously stated the issue of drainage, sewers, flooding etc will be fundamental in considering a scheme.
6.	The local authority is has "a duty to write to each property"	This event was run by the Gloucestershire Rural Community Council and the Parish Council to inform residents and ask for their views. This event was not part of the planning process and therefore no 'duty' exists. However, the public event held on 22 <sup>nd</sup> October 2013 was published in the parish newsletter and public notice boards in the village.
7.	The number of homes proposed varied depending on who was spoken too	The number of homes will be carefully considered and evidenced. Residents will be consulted on to ensure the number and dwelling types are right for the village.
8.	The size of the sites has not been advised and so is there a real need for affordable housing?	As above the number of homes will be evidenced and the size of the plot of land does not directly correlate.
9.	Affordable housing in rural areas was seen as difficult to understand due to the costs of living.	The need for affordable housing does not come from being on a low income or benefits. It comes from not being able to easily compete in the open market for housing accommodation.
10.	Hygrove House Nursing Home proposed to covert to affordable apartments and use of grounds to build accommodation.	Action: The council has been asked to discuss with Gloucestershire County Council their plans for the property and grounds.
11.	Links and needs with Highnam and Gloucester City for mutual benefit	The need for the village is the driver for a rural exception site not the need for other areas. There are no proposals to include the needs of the areas surrounding Minsterworth as this would be unacceptable in planning terms. A rural exception site also ensures that homes are built for local people in need.

**Notes of discussion at Minsterworth Parish Council 9<sup>th</sup> December 2013 affordable housing by Erin Davies**

Attendance by Erin Davies (Tewkesbury Borough Council) and Martin Hutchings (Gloucestershire Rural Community Council) to present the responses from the public event held Tuesday 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2013

ED went through the public comments for each site and responses to them by TBC and GRCC.

Richard Few (Chairman) clarified for that the land owner is on board.

It was seen as sensible to ensure that the Village Hall Trust was involved early to enable any changes to the entrance to be agreed.

Derek Davies (TBC Councillor) explained the principles of the Joint Core Strategy and the inevitable growth in the borough. It appeared that the parish council and residents in attendance agreed with comment that if development is going to come about in Minsterworth it is better to be the drivers of it, rather than it being imposed on the village.

There was a discussion on Section 106 legal agreements and possible developer contributions that could benefit the village.

It was clarified that Site B also had a willing land owner on board however they were not accepting of a site entrance being from Calcots Green and that it must be onto the A48. It was reminded that the Highway Authority stated that another access onto the A48 was not acceptable as there were already many access points. With this in mind the group felt that this was therefore not a strong possibility.

Derek Davies explained the potential process of delivering a scheme and that it is likely to be a few years off yet.

ED stated that she wishes to put together a plan for the 2015-2018 Homes and Communities Affordable Housing Programme where if Minsterworth is identified as a firm scheme, the likelihood of receiving financial support [via a Registered Provider] is greater.

ED stated that if the parish council want to take a further step in contacting Registered Providers of affordable housing to understand the level of interest and potential for development she would be able to start discussions.

A resident stated he was not happy that the meeting (and the presence of ED & MH) was not well advertised and the parish council responded accordingly. ED stated that she and MH are happy to attend further meetings, events and discussions with residents.

It was confirmed that residents can contact MH at GRCC with further comments on the sites and the document presented or do so via the parish council.

ED requested that the parish council discuss the steps they'd now like to take and inform ED & MH.

---end---