

<p>c. <i>Can we ensure that promises made by developers as above will be legally binding and must be delivered if they are allowed to develop housing in a specific area?</i> <i>Section 106 agreements are used to secure contributions from development and are legally binding and can and would be enforced by the LPA which grants planning permission.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The answer appears to mean NO. We need to take this into account when considering site suitability. <p>d. <i>Can we put in the NP that social housing should only go to “local” people? Is there an accepted definition of “local”? Or can we define “local” in the NP in a binding way that will then apply in Cricklade parish?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HT has put this question to colleagues in the New Housing Team and will get back to you. • Await response on this. <p>e. <i>If development is allowed outside the existing settlement boundary, can we specify a different proportion of affordable housing must be delivered or are we bound by the Core Strategy policy of 40%?</i></p> <p><i>Clearly Core Policy 43 sets the benchmark but it is clear that development viability will need to be considered too as part of the negotiations at planning application stage. NPPF para. 173 echoes this. Affordable housing requirements and proportions required locally should always be based on evidence.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence from Housing Needs Survey suggested smaller 2/3 bedroom houses and shortage of Affordable Housing required. <p>This led onto discussions about Extra Care Home and the further advice that this would go towards overall Housing needs in Cricklade. However the provision of extra care facilitates would not address the other housing needs locally. 2½ acres needed for extra care facility. As part of NP would have to include a Extra Care Home we would need to identify a site. Some work already undertaken by WC on this, but it has stalled. RS will try to establish what work if any has been done on any suitable sites none of which appear ideal.</p> <p>3. Housing numbers and scenarios</p> <p>It was felt that we could not wait on WC to establish numbers of houses and we should work on the available sites now even if we need to revisit later. Should we take two or three scenarios to work on? Agreed 3 to consider 40/50, 100, and above 150. The possibility of linking development to provision of Southern By pass was all but ruled out, similarly identifying other sites for possible Industrial Development (Chelworth) as not part of Wiltshire Core Strategy. If there are proposals to build outside the LDF then SEA vital. Each site to be looked at against the set criteria. Urchfont NP was recommended reading to see what an SEA can give us. Could 40 houses be built without going outside the settlement boundary?</p> <p>Next meeting need to compare criteria with each site. And produce pros and cons for each site and numbers possible. Need Greensquare input for possible Culverhay sites.</p>	<p>JH to request HT to clarify HT to clarify</p> <p>JH to request HT to clarify HT to clarify</p> <p>HT to clarify</p> <p>RS to update on work done regarding possible sites after next Extra Care Working Party meets</p> <p>ALL to commence work on scenario of 40/50 houses at next meeting.</p> <p>CRJ to make have available for next meeting, plan showing SLAR sites and also sites identified at consultation</p> <p>ALL next meeting to agree criteria which prospective sites will be reviewed and commence review of scenario 40/50 houses</p> <p>PB to provide information on Culverhay possible numbers JC to check number of 'windfall' properties in last 10 years</p>
---	--

4. Cricklade to Swindon Railway

Railway Society had responded but no map of route. JH thought that one existed already. CRJ had asked again for one.

5. Grant Application

DCLG had raised a number of points CRJ to respond

6. Common Places

JH to check progress on Purton and Villages WP

□

Future meetings

Next meeting date to be advised.

Agenda for next meeting:

- Present/Apologies
- Review Actions
- Commence work on Scenario 1 (40/50 houses)

CRJ to provide map of route for future possible railway

CRJ to chase grant application which would allow SEA to be done

JH to get feedback on Common Places performance so far on other projects