

Cricklade Neighbourhood Plan Working Party

NOTES FROM THE MEETING

Wednesday 9th October 2013 at 7pm in the Town Council Chamber

Present: Cllrs John Coole (Vice Chairman - JC), Mark Clarke (MC), Ruth Szybiak (RS), Bob Jones (BJ), Community Members: John Harmer (JH), Tim Russell (TR), David Tetlow (DT), Phil Bowley (Greensquare - PB), Chris Ball (CB), Henning Tetz (Wiltshire Council Link Officer – HT)
Tina Jones – Assistant Town Clerk

	ACTION
<p>Apologies. Rachel Stringer (Chairman - RST), Charlotte Rogers-Jones (Town Clerk - CRJ), Margaret Hunt (MH)</p>	
<p>1. JC chaired the meeting. JC to meet with RST to update on recent actions and decisions. RST expertise has been missed and Working Party (WP) members look forward to her attending future meetings. TR thanked JC for stepping up as Vice-Chairman</p>	JC/RST
<p>2. The notes of the meeting of 11 September were agreed. JH thanked HT for his support, speed of response and the information provided. WP members agreed for BJ is to discuss the reconvening of the Extra Care Working Group with the Area Board.</p>	BJ
<p>3. Action points from last meeting and new issues raised were considered as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • strategy writing training is with RS to follow up • JC to discuss Eco Team with RST, HT believes RST has already received a hard copy, HT to check • HT – Wiltshire Council is planning workshops in November and New Year – notice in parish magazine and NP website, all Parish Councils will receive an invite • RS had been contacted by Wiltshire Council's Economic Development team about Cricklade's involvement with Neighbourhood Planning 	RS JC/RST HT
<p>4. Finance - The grant application of £7,000 has been approved by 'Locality' (funded by the DCLG) which is the maximum payable under the scheme. 90% of the total is due for payment now and the remaining 10% on completion of the project. A communications pack has been provided with suggested press release wordings etc. The main terms and conditions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the grant monies must be used for the purposes of the project as laid out in the application, • CTC must provide the Community Development Foundation (CDF) with copies of all invoices over £1,000, • the grant receipt must be shown separately in the CTC accounts, • the award and source of the grant must be made public on the CTC website etc, • quarterly progress monitoring reports will be required, • the sums must be spent by the planned finish date of 1st October 2014, • the award can be terminated and the sums can become repayable for, among other things, a failure to make satisfactory progress 	RS
<p>CRJ to write a press release for inclusion on NP and CTC websites.</p>	CRJ

<p>There is a further £6,773 remaining in the CTC budget.</p> <p>5. Common Places – JH reported that he has contacted North East Wiltshire Villages group and they had been complimentary about the work relating to Common Places. Questions were asked as to their qualifications but MC confirmed their details had been submitted as part of the grant application and no queries had been raised. PCT Committee (10 June - min ref 13.22) passed a Resolution delegating to the Working Party the authority to instigate the work when appropriate. A meeting is to be arranged asap between Common Places, JC and RST to confirm all the elements we require and their capacity to undertake the work. CRJ to arrange meeting</p> <p>6. Officer Support – Although CRJ has not attended recent meetings, work has taken place and future WP meetings will have an officer present to take notes. Reports for inclusion on future agendas should be sent to CRJ as an attachment not in the body of an email as they can be easily missed. Any communications with WC should be sent via CRJ acting as point of contact. <u>Project Plan</u> WP members felt there they had no guidance or structure to work with, HT suggested a Project Plan should be put in place, setting out the entire process right through to adoption, and should include the elements already finished and those still outstanding. Each element to have clear direction and a required completion date. HT added that this document is vital to the process and forms part of the evidence review, the draft project plan should also be made available to Common Places to give them a clear steer as to the aims and objectives of the WP. There is guidance information for groups on the Wiltshire Council Neighbourhood Plan website but the gaps need to be filled by the project plan. It was agreed that JC/RST would look at websites of those who have completed their plans for guidance. JC to discuss with RST the provision of a Project Plan</p> <p>7. Partner Update: <u>HT, Wiltshire Council</u> - the Wiltshire Core Strategy consultation ended today, a report should be received in next month or two. If any modifications are required it will need to go back out for consultation. Training elements covered under point 3 above, topics from the focus groups are feeding through. <u>Swindon and Cricklade Railway (S&CR)</u> – HT is arranging a meeting with S&CR together with Swindon Borough Council, members of the WP were invited to attend, the offer was accepted. DT added that the Cricklade Country Way project has protected the route of the proposed canal and a route for the railway. HT added that these routes have been included in the Wiltshire Core Strategy, the railway route is for leisure not business and the proposed route is not favoured by S&CR. As the WP has not received formal response from S&CR, it was agreed for CRJ to request a written response one together with a map of the intended route for WP consideration, this will also act as evidence to prove we have consulted and identified their requirements even if we are not in a position to deliver. <u>English Heritage</u> – A letter has been received confirming that English Heritage would like to be involved in the process. <u>Outstanding Consultees:</u> Thames Water, Scottish & Southern Electric, Wales and West Utilities, British Telecom and Cable and Wireless were all contacted in March 2013, these need to be chased for responses by CRJ. (<i>CLERKS NOTE: a contact name, response and map have been provided by Thames Water</i>). HT has supplied a link to RS for the Wiltshire Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2) - Infrastructure Provider Profiles, which are based on the submissions from the utility companies which may be useful to the WP.</p> <p>8. Developer Update:</p>	<p>JC/RST CRJ</p> <p>JC/RST</p> <p>HT CRJ CRJ</p>
---	---

<p><u>David Wilson Homes</u> has withdrawn their offer on the land at The Forty – WP members agreed for JC to contact the developers to ascertain the reason for their withdrawal.</p>	JC
<p><u>Beechcroft</u> are presenting their proposal at the 11 November PCT committee meeting</p>	
<p><u>Horse Down Concept</u>: written proposal is with RS as chair of the Housing Focus Group.</p>	RS
<p><u>Other Groups</u>: Mr Mobey had confirmed that he would be responding.</p>	
<p>9. Focus Group (FG) Updates: <u>Housing – RS</u></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • looked at the % of affordable housing requirements which is 40% over 5 dwellings • Considered different sites and the need to identify sites based on SEA and criteria set by WP. HT- The scoping report gives an assessment template to test sites against. This needs to be done before the impact assessment • Clarification as to whether RS should respond to comments in isolation to other Focus Groups was sought and whether similar questions could be grouped for responses. HT – advised to be careful on responses, if someone is not happy with a response they could go to examining board. RS to take forward 	
<p><i>(BJ left the meeting)</i></p>	RS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussions around whether a consultation should take place before consideration is given to moving the boundary to accommodate additional housing, HT added that housing and other groups need to input employment against housing and seriously look at the SEA first as this would enable people to see the full impact otherwise consultations would be never ending and the FG need to link to share information better. 	
<p><u>Public Realm -DT</u></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus groups have met a few times • Analysis of all open space sites in Cricklade done, a 6 page document with background analysis and feedback from the consultation has been prepared. • Cemetery may be an issue if 350 houses are built, identified shortage of allotments and play areas. Sports space is fine but this is due to Prior Park School but those sports grounds are private. Public Amenities are well used, it is clear that the feeling in the community is that open space should be protected, but some did feel it was appropriate to develop in some open space areas. • Possible policies have been drafted (not in policy speak) to go with other FG information to form the plan. 	
<p><u>Business, Town Centre & Traffic – CB</u></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looked at changes of use from business to residential • Parking in the High Street – looking in to the possibility of adding a time restriction to on street parking to free up spaces (DT added that the existing car parks could be extended so they need to be protected from development) • Restriction of HGV's to certain parts of High Street (HT agreed to set up a meeting with WC Highways and FG to discuss options to ensure only deliverables are included) • Developing a policy on equestrian development to ensure inappropriate development does not take place • Business growth development on Chelworth restriction to prevent increased HGV, possible business growth off A419 could alleviate problem or relocation of Chelworth businesses to A419 releasing existing land for residential use. HT felt Chelworth was too far outside the boundary and would create an additional settlement. HT added an HGV report would provide key evidence to 	

<p>draw conclusions from (JH has almost finished the report) and a meeting with a local estate agent would provide local rental figures. The core strategy allocated a formula to use to cross subsidise employment with housing. HT to email evidence paper. (HT left the meeting)</p>	HT
<p>10. Focus Group Meetings: CB feels the individual FG should join forces; DT added the FG felt out of touch with other groups. CR there is a need to see the whole package and not in isolation. Following further discussions WP members agreed to disband the FG. CRJ to notify those not present (CB left the meeting)</p>	CRJ
<p>11. Chronicle And Other Articles MC has included a piece in the November issue of the Chronicle</p>	
<p>12. Public Consultation Date Deferred</p>	CRJ/DT
<p>13. Approval of Notes for Website</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WP members approved the notes for WP and FG up to and including 11 September 2013 these can be added to the NP website. • DT – NP website has not been updated since the consultation and the audit trail needs to be recreated. • The grant news needs to be added under ‘News’ sections of both CTC and NP websites with a FACEBOOK announcement, this will encourage the public to look at all the documents 	DT CRJ/DT
<p>14. Items for Next Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To agree that FG members are co-opted to WP (to enable vote) • To discuss provision of Project Plan • To agree the article for the December Chronicle • To agree a Public Consultation date • To discuss housing numbers across community area • All future meetings to have a main focus topic 	CRJ JC/RST /CRJ CRJ to publish
<p>15. Dates of Next Working Party Meeting WP members agreed the following dates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 23 October (apologies from JC,TR,CR,PB) • 06 November • 20 November • 04 December • All Wednesdays 18.00 – 21.00 hrs to be booked out to NP – CTC Office to be advised of requirements 	
<p>Meeting Closed at 9.15pm</p>	