

Cricklade Neighbourhood Plan Working Party Meeting

NOTES FROM THE MEETING

Wednesday 27th 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: John Harmer (JH) and Phil Bowley (PB).

Clerk: Charlotte Rogers-Jones (CRJ).

	ACTION
<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE Received from Chris Ball (CB), Tim Russell (TR), Carolyn Russell (CR) and David Tetlow (DT).</p> <p>1. TO APPROVE THE NOTES FROM THE MEETING HELD ON 5TH MARCH 2014 The notes were approved as an accurate reflection of decisions and actions.</p> <p>2. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENT</p> <p>The Chairman asked if he could make an announcement as follows:</p> <p>a. That he had some concerns about the differing opinions being expressed by the two organisations supporting the work of the NP: One opinion being to develop a criteria based approach to the plan, and the other opinion to develop a site specific approach to the plan. The WP needed clarification before it could proceed.</p> <p>b. That the WC site allocation consultation document was out for consideration and comment and so work could be hampered until the results were known</p> <p>c. That the quote from CP for project management needed to be carefully considered.</p> <p>d. In light of this he proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A review of what the NPWP had achieved so far, where it was heading, and whether the high work load and expense justified the end result• That caution be exercised in spending a large sum of money on project management.• That a future meeting consider the way forward as members were absent from this meeting. <p>e. <i>Members of the NPWP made the following observations which are not verbatim but give a general flow of the discussion:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Building in Cricklade was inevitable and therefore was the expense of the NP justified?2. Wiltshire Council was undertaking similar work to the NPWP in case the Neighbourhood Plan failed, so could this duplication of work be avoided in Cricklade?3. The Open Spaces in Cricklade needed to be protected and without a Neighbourhood Plan the town could be open to many applications for development.	

4. If Wiltshire Council produced their housing site allocation plan in advance of Cricklade completing the NP, then it would be a wasted exercise as Cricklade would need to adopt the WC site allocation plan.
5. The NP could concentrate on looking at appropriate housing sites and safeguarding the open spaces by establishing a plan that highlights the areas that must be protected.
6. The expenditure on producing the plan might seem high but when spread over a 10 year period (the life of the plan) it was reduced to approximately £1,500 per annum.
7. The future costs associated with amending the plan at the scrutiny and referendum stage were unknown by CTC. Some Front Runner Plans had been published, with financial support, but little was known about the other plans in progress.
8. The Cricklade NP could be challenged by developers, either on the soundness of the plan or site allocations.
9. Freedom of Information requests could be made to see what has been spent on the production of a plan.
10. The NPWP could concentrate on the type of houses to be built and produce a plan along these lines, so as not to let the people of Cricklade down.
11. An additional £500 per new household might be allocated to the town through the Community Infrastructure Levy, if a NP is produced.
12. The settlement boundary is under review by Wiltshire, on orders from the Planning Inspector.
13. Further Gypsy and Traveller sites are being considered and Cricklade, whilst having plenty of sites, could be asked to take more sites.
14. Would CTC be better working more closely with WC to influence the work that they have to do and ensure that the sites for development in Cricklade are in line with the WC site allocation map? For CTC to do further work on the site allocation but pass those suggestions to WC for them to further the work and test the sites against their own criteria. WC will be obliged to listen to the wishes of the community and so this would be a method of having influence without having to produce a plan.
15. Could a partial plan be produced that looked at style and density but not actual site allocation?
16. Whatever is produced, it must be deliverable, has to have support of the community and it ran the risk of failing to identify sites for affordable housing.
17. The Secretary of State recently overruled an appeals process and allowed for development to continue anyway and so the government still have the final say and WC still have the influence over the number of houses being built and the investment in the highways.
18. The community would need to be informed of any outcome, either by letter or a public meeting.
19. The public might need to be consulted, although disappointment was expressed

that the community involvement and volunteer support had been limited to date.

20. Any site selected for development must cater for affordable housing based on the housing needs survey.
 21. The outcome of the NP is unknown but developers cannot build on North Meadow, between North Meadow and the town boundary and Fairview Fields. This leaves a few remaining development sites and it is inevitable that these will be built on.
 22. What is the plan actually giving Cricklade? Will it give protection?
 23. Developers are already making applications and will continue to do so whether a plan is in place or not. Therefore the effort in producing the plan seems unbalanced with the outcome that is being offered.
 24. Further suggestions were made as an alternative proposal to abandoning a plan: To create a smaller team that liaises with the developers and tries to reach compromises, smoothes the process and ensures that influence is exerted. For the Town Plan to be revisited and adopted.
 25. As the whole group seemed to have many reservations it seemed appropriate to have a meeting to discuss the above and decide a way forward. If the NPWP was considering reducing its output then an urgent decision needed to be made regarding the role and work being undertaken by CP.
- f. After the discussion the meeting came to the conclusion that:
1. It was necessary to discuss the above at another meeting to decide a way forward
 2. It was necessary to contact Common Places to put their work on hold
 3. It would be useful to ask Wiltshire Council Planning Officers for an opinion on the best way forward
 4. It would be useful to look at what other local plans are being developed or published and where they are.
 5. The Chairman speak to Henning Totz, the Link Officer at WC re all the above.

3. TO RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON:

a) Questions to Wiltshire Highways

The meeting had been attended which had proved to be useful. The notes were still with WC. JH confirmed that there was no money to upgrade the roads, but at least the NPWP had asked the relevant questions and could demonstrate that a process had been followed.

b) Cricklade to Swindon Railway (DT)

Nothing to report.

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

Nothing to report.

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

The next meeting will be on 30th April 2014.

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

Nothing to report but that meetings were taking place and progress being made.

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

Greensquare was conducting one to one discussions with residents and owner/occupiers of properties. This should be completed during April. The plans would then be revised and would give an indication of the number of new homes that could be built. A planning application would be submitted later in 2014. Residents will be made aware of the developments on other Greensquare sites to explain about the quality of the build. The Greensquare team would be considering the impact of development on the sewerage system, and planned to enhance the landscape to improve drainage in the area. There was a brief discussion on the "bedroom tax" (BJ confirmed that only 12% of residents were affected) and the cost of living increases.

8. TO RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON THE WILTSHIRE CORE STRATEGY

Nothing to report.

9. ISSUES TO CONSIDER:

a. Housing

Nothing to report

b. Business

CB has information that he wishes to share with the group at the next meeting.

10. TO RECEIVE A BUDGET UPDATE

CRJ needs to complete the mid-term grant report which will say that some work is ongoing.

11. ITEMS FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION AND FOR RECOMMENDATIONS TO PLANNING COMMITTEE

Nothing to report.

12. SEMINAR: CHIPPENHAM ON 14TH APRIL

MC and CRJ to attend.

13. ANY OTHER ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

- a. The Area Board were investing some money into Community Led Planning and several events would be held over the coming months, one of which would be in Cricklade (date confirmed as Thursday 15th May).
- b. The Cricklade Town Plan would be discussed at a future Strategic Planning meeting. The outstanding action points have been considered by some members of the council but more work needs to be done

14. DATES OF WORKING PARTY MEETINGS AT 6PM:

The next meeting will take place on Thursday 17th April at 6pm.

The meeting closed at 7.40pm