

Cricklade Neighbourhood Plan Housing Focus Group

Wednesday 4th September 2013 at 7pm in the Town Council Chamber

Present: Mark Clarke (MC) Cricklade Town Councillor and member of NP Working Party, John Harmer (JH) Community member and member of NP Working Party, Margaret Hunt (MH) Community member, Phil Bowley (PB), Head of Regeneration GreenSquare Group, Bob Jones(BJ) Cricklade Town Councillor, Wiltshire Councillor and member of the NP Working Party, Peter Moran (PM) Community member, Ruth Szybiak (RS) Cricklade Town Councillor, John Coole (JC) Cricklade Town Councillor and Vice Chairman of the NP Working Party), Carolyn Russell (CR) Community Member.

NOTES FROM THE MEETING

	ACTION
<p>1. Introductions and Apologies Introductions. Welcome to Carolyn Russell who was a new member. Apologies from David Tetlow were noted.</p>	
<p>2. Chairman Further discussion about chairmanship of the Group. No one felt they were able to volunteer. MC agreed to chair the meeting. JC to take notes. Some discussion on merits of continuing with focus groups which we should take back to NPWP.</p>	CJ (agenda)
<p>3. Stage 1 Consultation Feedback The public consultation feedback had been reviewed by JH, MC, MH, and PB and the group discussed the results. This action had been very time consuming and it was felt that to provide formal comment about each response was simply too time consuming and could perhaps be done more simply, particularly as the conclusions drawn were very similar with similar issues. JH will check requirement to do this with HT.</p> <p>PB produced a useful map detailing where the responses had indicated development should take place. Mixed development favoured, and depending on the definition of average (mean, median or mode) and whether extreme values were excluded or not the number of additional houses ranged between 40 and 97. This gave some steer from the public on what would be considered acceptable. Many responses highlighted the need for adequate Car Parking, and also for additional Play areas (this needs to be cross referenced to Public Realm group).</p>	JH
<p>4. Location Most of the sites identified by the consultation fitted with SHLAA . It was agreed that we needed to set criteria for selecting which of these sites should be considered most suitable for development. Should we then as a group rank these in order of preference or should we ask the question 'how many do you want and where do you want them?'. It was felt that by setting criteria we could immediately exclude some sites as not meeting the needs of the community, but trying to explain the cost/balance needs for other sites when major infrastructure was required would be difficult e.g there may need to be a minimum number of houses to support the infrastructure investment needs in order for any developer to be able to commence. These constraints and limitations would need to be adequately explained to ensure the responses to another round of consultation gave a deliverable way forward.</p>	
<p>5. Wiltshire Council latest advice on housing numbers was considered confusing. A minimum of 42 were needed across the Area (excluding RWB) to meet need, but as a "local service centre" up to 400 homes could be considered by Cricklade and still meet with the Core Strategy provided a local need could be evidenced. If all the SHLAA sites were to be used they would produce 780 homes. It was suggested there was a need to come up with a definitive number for a high growth scenario based on the results, analysis, and Wilts Council advice, but as this was not what had been supported in earlier consultations some explanation would be needed and such a scenario appeared unlikely to be supported.</p>	ALL
<p>6. Criteria – The main issues identified were Flooding, Transport including parking and</p>	

congestion, and sustainability. Full list attached. Should we produce list for public consultation and ask for the issues to be ranked in order, or request people to select the top five they view as a priority? It was noted that there were many examples where historic development had not met this criteria in the past.

7.Homework - Agreed that we should research other Neighbourhood Plans with a view to adopting best practice. Also the DCLG website which has been extended and a useful resource.

8. Future meetings Next meeting to be **18th September at 6pm** before Public Realm Focus Group. Clearly need to extend deadline for report – need to review at NPWP

CJ for agenda

Criteria

1. Flooding including surface water and sewage disposal
2. Coalescence with Swindon
3. Transport including parking and congestion
4. Sustainability - closeness to High Street and local schools. Also other amenities and services.
5. Safe access for pedestrians and cyclists
6. Road and infrastructure – safe access for new development and existing users
7. Availability of Land and topography visibility. Protection of rights of way.
8. Conservation Area protection - Impact on historic setting of Cricklade
9. Environmental Impact – protection of habitat (hedges etc)
10. Visual Impact viewing from both out of the Town and looking from the Town.
11. Other constraints – Electricity substation, route of Cricklade Country Way, North Meadow SSSI