

Cricklade Neighbourhood Plan Working Party Meeting

NOTES FROM THE MEETING

Wednesday 20th November 2013 at 7pm in the Town Council Chamber

NPWP Members Present: Rachel Stringer (Chairman (RSt)), Cllr John Coole (Vice Chairman (JC)), Cllr Mark Clarke (MC), Cllr Ruth Szybiak (RSz), Cllr Bob Jones (BJ), Community Members: John Harmer (JH), Tim Russell (TR), Phil Bowley (PB), Chris Ball (CB), Carolyn Russell, Julian Robinson (JR). Clerk: Charlotte Rogers-Jones (CRJ), Clerk

	ACTION
<p>1. Apologies; David Tetlow (DT), Henning Tetz (HT), Margaret Hunt (MH).</p>	
<p>2. Welcome: The Chairman welcomed Julian Robinson to his first meeting. Julian was attending as a member of the business community.</p>	
<p>3. To approve the notes from the meeting held on 13th November 2013 JH asked for amendments to be made to the minutes, but it was agreed that the minutes reflected the decisions and actions from that meeting.</p>	
<p>4. To consider action points from the above meeting not on this agenda</p> <p>a) Terms of Reference. There are only TORs for Focus Groups and not the Working Party. CRJ was asked to produce some TORs</p> <p>b) The meeting had taken place with Common Places</p> <p>c) CRJ had spoken to the Clerk at Royal Wootton Bassett about their NP process. CRJ had contacted some local planning consultants to submit an outline of their capabilities</p> <p>d) The baseline information to be carried forward to a future meeting</p> <p>e) CRJ had asked HT for an update on the outstanding discussion with Cricklade and Swindon Railway.</p> <p>f) CRJ was preparing the Chronicle entry</p> <p>g) RSt had made enquiries to HT about policy writing</p> <p>h) BJ was waiting for an update on the Extra Care Facility</p>	<p>CRJ</p> <p>CRJ</p> <p>CRJ</p> <p>CRJ</p> <p>CRJ</p> <p>RSt</p> <p>BJ</p>
<p>5. Common Places - an update A report was circulated, which is attached. There was a discussion about the need for an SEA and whether Common Places could project manage the plan for CTC. Issues raised were whether there was a need for an SA and whether there was a need for project management.</p> <p>The following proposals were made:</p> <p>a. That CTC employs Common Places for 2 days to undertake a review of existing evidence and produce a fixed price quote for the project management of the plan. Specifically, Common Places would need to estimate how much time and effort was expected from members of the working party and from the clerk.</p> <p>b. That if Common Places were to be employed to produce the SA that a letter be drafted, and sent to David Way at Wiltshire Council for approval, instructing Common Places to produce the report in accordance with the relevant directives, in order to give some protection to CTC.</p> <p>c. For the approval for expenditure in employing Common Places for 2 days work to undertake the evaluation to be sought from the PCT Committee.</p>	<p>CRJ</p> <p>CRJ</p> <p>CRJ</p>
<p>6. Project Plan It was agreed that this item be left until Common Places had made a proposal.</p>	<p>CRJ</p>
<p>7. Partner Update Questions via Henning Tetz to Wiltshire Highways</p> <p>a. Questions had been circulated to all members of the working party, asking for</p>	

<p>members to either approve or pose alternative questions. Many members felt that the questions should be shortened, made more specific and only deal with issues for the future.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>(BJ and JR left the meeting at this point)</i></p> <p>b. As there was a difference of opinion over the questions, and revised questions had been proposed by RSz, a proposal was made for members of the WP to decide which was their preferred way forward:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. To submit the question unaltered ii. To revise the questions iii. To wait and seek advice from Common Places <p>c. It was agreed by the majority that the revised questions would be considered and that the suggested questions proposed by RSz be sent, via CRJ, to all members of the working party, asking them for a decision by 22nd November, on whether the revised questions remain as they are, or these questions be further amended.</p> <p><i>(Clerk's Note: An email was sent to 15 members of the WP, and the response was positive with 10 members saying the questions should be sent unedited, one person expressing no opinion and 2 people objecting to the revised questions).</i></p>	<p>CRJ</p>
<p>8. Developer Update Nothing to report.</p> <p>9. Issues to consider It was agreed that with the involvement of Common Places things might be seen in a new way and that a different approach could be adopted in reviewing the data and submitting more information for a consultation. Housing needed to be discussed in more detail, in relation to site, numbers and the criteria. It was suggested that Common Places might facilitate a workshop that focussed on housing to explore ideas. This would need to be included within the quotation that they would be providing.</p>	<p>CRJ</p>
<p>10. To consider the working party budget requirement for 2014/2015</p> <p>a. Following a discussion on the current financial position and the receipt of the grant, it was suggested that the working party might need a further £10,000 to complete the project. It would be necessary to look at the grant criteria to see if there was any flexibility on what the money could specifically be spent on.</p> <p>b. It was agreed that a further £3k would be needed but that the decision be delegated to the Planning Committee.</p>	<p>JC</p>
<p>11. Items for future consideration The Chronicle article would be written next week.</p>	<p>CRJ</p>
<p>12. Any Other Business Nothing to report</p> <p>13. Date of next Working Party Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 4th December (apologies submitted by CB) <p>The meeting close at 8.40pm.</p>	

CRICKLADED NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
Meeting with Common Places – Tuesday 19th November 2013 at 6.30pm
Mark Clarke, John Coole, Charlotte Rogers-Jones from CTC
Mark Goodman and Sarah Martin from Common Places

1. Purpose of the meeting: to establish if Common Places are still able to give support to CTC to implement a Neighbourhood Plan. Confusion had arisen over the specific studies and surveys that needed to be undertaken. Clarity was sought on whether a Sustainability Appraisal was needed, and whether CTC needed to commission work on a SEA and a HRA.
2. What had been achieved so far: setting up a working party, public consultation, surveys, setting up focus groups, lengthy discussion. Common Places gave an outline of the work it is doing with RWB Council, the NEW-V parishes and other town councils in the south west.
3. Common Places would be able to assist with options and deliver policies after doing initial screening via Wiltshire Council. Wiltshire Council would look at the draft plan and advice on what level an SEA, an SA and an HRA would need to be undertaken. It is necessary for every NP to have an SA and from this build on top the SEA and HRA, dependent on need. WC has already advised that an SEA is necessary for Cricklade and this should be documented in papers. This needs to be checked as WC screening at various stages is part of the process. They would advise on the degree the SEA would need to go, being general or site specific.
4. Common Places would be able to project manage to get the project back on track. They are competent at delivering the project and would use templates for completing the report. They would approach Wiltshire Council to determine the level of work that was required within an SEA and SA and would either complete the work, or assist the TC in completing the work. It was important to stress that the plan needed to be the product of the NPWP and therefore it would not be right to delegate all work to a planning organisation to complete.
5. CP would revisit the proposal/quote to include the work on the SEA, Refine various aspects of work already completed e.g. consultation event (we do need to ensure that points raised are answered), check for gaps in process, consult public over criteria.
6. They would not attend all the NPWP meetings, but where necessary. Liaison would be with Charlotte and they would assist in setting goals, objectives, agendas, action lists and expect the work to be carried out by the WP and Clerk. There would be an additional charge and therefore they were requested to provide a list of activities that they could undertake, with likely time and cost. They confirmed that they have the capacity to undertake the work and have regular contact with WC on their other projects. They anticipate the work being complete, including the referendum, in 2014.
7. There was a further discussion on housing and having seen the 11 point list of criteria advised that the best plans that were being produced were not site specific. Being site specific enabled the price of the land to go up and for developers to enter a bidding war for a specific site, often stalling development and causing building in other areas that have not been allocated within the plan. Non site specific plans also need less specific SEAs and HRAs. Criteria to build should be positive.
8. Criteria should be written in a positive way but is possible to steer towards sites without ruling out others.
 - ⤴ Development would be supported provided the following conditions are met.
 - ⤴ Not on flood plain
 - ⤴ Easy access to Town centre schools etc. for pedestrians and cyclists
 - ⤴ Should be located within x miles of Town Centre.
 - ⤴ Number and type of houses including affordable requirements
 - ⤴ CIL contribution

If plan is site specific and development does not take place another developer can circumvent plan on the grounds that the housing numbers are not being met. This would then leave the original site to be developed later and would be difficult to object as it was the favoured site. Another advantage is that HRA would possibly not be required and could be included as part of the criteria for support.