

Cricklade Neighbourhood Plan Working Party Meeting

NOTES FROM THE MEETING

Wednesday 5th March 2014 at 6pm in the Town Council Chamber

NPWP Members Present:

Cllr Mark Clarke (Chairman, (MC)), Cllr John Coole (Vice Chairman (JC)), Cllr Bob Jones (BJ), Cllr Ruth Szybiak (RS).

Community Members: Tim Russell (TR), Carolyn Russell (CR), John Harmer (JH), David Tetlow (DT).
Clerk: Charlotte Rogers-Jones (CRJ). WC Link Officer: Henning Totz (HT)

	ACTION
<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE Received from Phil Bowley and Chris Ball.</p> <p>1. TO APPROVE THE NOTES FROM THE MEETING HELD ON 5TH FEBRUARY 2014</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Item 3 JH challenged the validity of the notes and raised an issue over whether he had been tasked with this item. He asked that the minutes be amended to say that “following a discussion on whether it was necessary to respond to the individual comments from the consultation, JH agreed to circulate a question to allocation to members of the WP”. • Item 6 JH challenged the wording of the item but members agreed to leave the minute as they stood. • Item 10 JH challenged the wording to say that the site density “could” (rather than “would”) be increased by 48%. • Para 9 JH challenged the minutes and asked a bullet point to be moved to the end of para 9. <p>2. TO APPROVE THE NOTES FROM THE MEETING HELD ON 18TH FEBRUARY 2014 TR complemented the Chairman on an excellent set of notes.</p> <p>3. UPDATE FROM HENNING TOTZ MC had previously submitted questions to HT for consideration</p> <p>a. When will the settlement boundary be updated? A previous email from Henning that was circulated stated: <i>SHLAA Sites:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>44 was completed in the year ending April 2012 – it may still be on the map as we hadn’t surveyed it as being complete by the time we carried out the SHLAA assessment.</i> • <i>45 was completed in the year in the year ending April 2006 – not sure why this has not been removed.</i> • <i>138, 3091 and 2038 – these were all excluded from the 2012 SHLAA as outside the settlement framework) as they also were in the 2100 assessment). However we do not remove land from the SHLAA even if it is excluded in one particular year, as changes in the SHLAA criteria or policy in a later year may mean a previously excluded site could become suitable later. A current example of such a change would be the settlement boundaries review as part of the Site Allocation work following the Core Strategy.</i> • <i>3191 is the last SHLAA site we have received in Cricklade – this is not on the 2012 maps as it was received in July 2013 so after the cut off date for 2012. It</i> 	<p>CRJ to amend the minutes</p>

will be included in the 2013 SHLAA but we have not yet carried out the assessments for this year.

- b. HT reported that the SHLAA sites are not fully compliant with the North Wilts Plan but they are not to be excluded and that the SHLAA sites will be subject to a further consultation.
- c. What was the relationship between the SHLAA site allocation and the Neighbourhood Plan site allocation? Not sure but WC would be keen to develop a working relationship between their work and that of the NPWP so that the WC allocation was similar, should the NP fail and not be adopted. There must always be a supply of housing stock and so necessary for WC to undertake the allocation despite the emerging NP.
- d. The methodology for allocating sites within the framework/settlement boundary was still being prepared. If the NP identified a site outside of the framework boundary could the boundary be redrawn to include it? Yes. Site allocations prepared by WC would provide a backup plan to those areas that either didn't have a NP or had a NP that failed at the adoption stage. Henning proposed that the way forward was to develop a site selection criteria, to score the criteria and then to select the most suitable sites. However it was felt that it would be necessary to understand the criteria that WC would be using to deliver the site allocation in advance of Cricklade NPWP doing the work.
- e. The Housing allocation figures had now been published. There were 101 for the RWB and Cricklade area, an increase of 56. These figures had to be deliverable and therefore there was some flexibility within the allocation. It would be necessary for the NP areas to deliver a Memorandum of Understanding to see that they and other areas could deliver. What if an application for a development of 300 homes were to be submitted in RWB? Would this impact on the deliverability of the number of houses required in this area? HT was unsure.
- f. There is a minimum housing number for Cricklade so the Neighbourhood Plan must demonstrate a minimum of number of houses within it. The NP also needed to determine which sites were suitable for development rather than leaving it to the developer to make that decision. However all sites are subject to the owner wishing to sell and develop and it is highly likely that a land owner might never release suitable land for development. The SHLAA only illustrates what could be developed.
- g. The council must deliver evidence to demonstrate what the council has done to liaise with the landowner.
- h. Following a discussion about site allocation a member asked if the settlement boundary could be moved back inwards, if the boundary had been moved to accommodate a new site that subsequently was not developed. Henning did not know.
- i. The Neighbourhood Plan would need to be reviewed on a regular basis through liaison with the landowners. A review would be undertaken to ensure that sites that had been chosen could be un-allocated if they had not delivered within an established time frame. The plan had to be reviewed against deliverability.

MC would speak to the NEW V Chairman to discuss allocation of housing in the area.

4. TO RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON WORK WITH COMMON PLACES

The Evidence Base Assessment has been circulated and the following observations were made:

MC to
arrange
visit

<p>a. The Town Plan had not been formally adopted by the Town Council as the council had not agreed to responsible for all the action points. This situation would need to be clarified.</p> <p>b. The demographics for the completion of the Town Plan were available and would need to be passed to Common Places.</p> <p>c. DT added that Facebook had been used to although this had been in “inform” people rather than consult and engage with them.</p> <p>d. The challenge seen by Common Places was to engage with younger people and the business community.</p> <p>e. It was suggested that individuals read the document and send comments to MC for consideration before sending back to Common Places.</p> <p>f. HT asked who was preparing the documents that the WP needed to consult on: the Issues and the Options Plan? He suggested that someone needed to pull these items together and produce an over-arching document that asked the community what it thought of the issues and options.</p> <p>g. RS suggested that incentives be offered to encourage the younger community to respond to questionnaires. However it was important that the right questions were asked.</p> <p>h. HT concluded that it would be necessary to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Describe the current position o To produce a base line o To consider and list the options o To consult (ie these are the site that have been assessed, what is the public’s point of view?) <p>j. The meeting needed to decide what it was consulting on and when and that the questions should be closed and lead towards identifying sites for development.</p> <p>k. The WP had developed an 11 point criteria but this was not ranked in order of importance although it was leading towards a site specific allocation. HT suggested that site specific was the most productive way forward.</p> <p>l. There was a general discussion on possible development at Green Square, on Reeds, house type and density and site selection and the criteria. It was to be remembered that not all sites were for housing, but that some should remain as open spaces.</p> <p>m. HT agreed to see if he could produce a template to enable the WP develop the criteria. It would then be necessary for the group to develop the criteria, possibly in a workshop setting, and then to weight the criteria. This exercise would then exclude some sites from suitability for development. It was agreed that Common Places be approached to design and deliver a workshop that will enable the group to develop the criteria. The workshop could be used as evidence that the discussion had taken place. MC agreed to produce a list of potential development sites.</p> <p>n. Project management and time line TR considered it very serious that the WP did not have a time line to work to, and that CP should be chased. However CP were waiting for feedback from the Evidence Base Assessment before they will produce the quotation for project management. TR pressed that it was essential to have a time line that could be</p>	<p>All to note</p> <p>CRJ to ask CP to design workshop</p>
---	--

published to demonstrate that work was being done. However, concern was expressed over what CP might actually be able to deliver. Project Management could be done by the group by looking at what needs to be achieved and assigning names to each task. CP needs to establish where the WP was before it could produce a quote for project management. However it was feasible that the WP could undertake its own project management with support from HT.

It was agreed that a copy of the timeline produced by RS and CP be circulated to the members of the WP.

CRJ to
circulate

5. TO RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON:

a) Questions to Wiltshire Highways

MC, TR and JH had attended the meeting with Highways on 6th March.

b) Cricklade to Swindon Railway (DT)

DT had been liaising with C to SR, who were working hard to have their route adopted into the Core Strategy. They were undertaking more studies and surveys and would have information available in Autumn 2014. They had asked where the residents of Cricklade would prefer the railway station. TR suggested that the C to SR would need to give the WP a rough idea of the route to allow the choosing of a specific site. DT suggested that the NPWP should know where its development would be going before choosing a site for the station. HT added that the report from the C to SR would need to be sent to WC Planning Dept for comments. TR added that the C to SR would have an input into the next round of consultation on the NP. DT would continue liaising with the C to SR.

6. TO RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON DEVELOPER ACTIVITY – PLANNING APPLICATION 13/07132/OUT

BJ would see if the application had been called in.

7. TO RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON CAMPUS ACTIVITY (RS)

It was anticipated that a planning application would be submitted late spring/early summer. Stone's Lane would provide a wealth of services that could be used to inform the NP.

8. TO RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON THE EXTRA CARE FACILITY (BJ)

The group had held its second meeting and land for development was their primary outcome. It had considered a facility based on clusters, where a group of flats/accommodation would be sited together but with additional services and the support provided within the Campus. This was the cheaper option and there might be WC money set aside to develop a "Carer HQ". It was likely that housing development within Culverhay would count within the overall housing requirements for Cricklade. Green Square would consider the proposals made by the Extra Care Facility meeting and suggest a plan.

JH expressed concern that it should not be the NPWP deciding on land allocation. JH asked if some of the extra care facilities be incorporated into housing developments in other areas of town. Do they all have to be sited in one place? Some could be sited in the town centre, but the remainder could be allocated on other SHLAA sites and built as part of other developments.

9. TO RECEIVE A REPORT FROM THE CULVERHAY STEERING GROUP (MC)

MC was the council's representative. There had been a public consultation and presentation and the feedback was currently confidential. The next step was to undertake interviews with individual residents.

10. TO RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON THE WILTSHIRE CORE STRATEGY

The latest documents had been circulated.

11. ISSUES TO CONSIDER:

a. Housing

Replies had been received from MC, RS and PB on the housing questions and a response was being pulled together. RS had produced some charts and MC had added the text. It explains that the documents are summary of the feedback from the survey.

DT had undertaken the same exercise with Public Realm and CB would be completing something similar with the Business questions. A final report would then bring the 3 subjects together.

12. TO RECEIVE A BUDGET UPDATE

No change.

13. ITEMS FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION AND FOR RECOMMENDATION TO PLANNING COMMITTEE

Nothing.

14. SEMINAR: CHIPPENHAM ON 14TH APRIL

TR asked why a space had not been reserved on the seminar in Warminster?
No members were interested in attending either seminar.

15. ANY OTHER ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

For CP to design the format for a workshop to develop the criteria. To be organised in the week commencing 17th March. MC would set up a Doodle to identify people's availability.

MC to
arrange

16. DATES OF WORKING PARTY MEETINGS AT 6PM:

- Thursday 27th March 2014.

The meeting closed at 8.10pm.