

Cricklade Neighbourhood Plan Working Party Meeting

NOTES FROM THE MEETING

Wednesday 7th July 2014 at 6pm in the Town Council Chamber

NPWP Members Present:

Councillors: Mark Clarke (MC), John Coole (JC), Sue Holbrook, Bob Jones and Ruth Szybiak.
Community Members: Phil Bowley (P), John Harmer (JH), David Tetlow (DT), Tim Russell (TR), Carolyn Russell (CR). Charlotte Rogers-Jones (CRJ) (Clerk) and Henning Totz (HT) (WC link officer).

	ACTION
<p>1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE All present.</p> <p>2. TO APPROVE THE NOTES FROM THE MEETING HELD ON 29th MAY 2014 The notes were accepted as an accurate recording of the decisions and actions.</p> <p>3. TO RECEIVE AN UPDATE FROM HENNING TOTZ</p> <p>a. The Core Strategy Being considered with Inspector's findings being published in due course; either it being sound and to be adopted, it being sound but with need for some modifications and the need to consult, or it being unsound and therefore be to reconsidered.</p> <p>b. Site Application and Settlement Boundary Review Consultation Councils will shortly be receiving information on the consultation running from 28th July for an 8 week period. Results should be known by the end of the year when the site proposals would be made.</p> <p>RS asked whether the work being undertaken by WC could impact on the work being undertaken by the NPWP in Cricklade. HT believed that WC would consider all the evidence and outcomes from any consultation conducted by CNPWP and consider this in their scoping work. It was expected that WC would have to deliver the site allocation plan in 2015, and that a broad timetable would be issued in due course. The more deliverable the plan, the smoother the process would be at adoption stage.</p> <p>Currently, WC was deciding on the process, methodology and criteria and it would be communicated to the parishes. SH enquired about the specific number of houses for this town; HT explained that the figures in the core strategy are a minimum deliverable number and additional houses could be built if there was evidence to support this.</p> <p>4. OTHER ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION</p> <p>a. Feedback from the Neighbourhood Plan Workshop – 25th June CRJ and RS had attended a NP workshop, with the following observations to report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Steering Group should ideally be an autonomous group and not a Working Party of the council.• The vision needed to come from the community and be done at the beginning of the process. Once the vision was set, it could be reviewed after the community was further consulted and evidence was received from the community.• The steering group should be made up of representatives of the community and representing as broad a population as possible. Without support the plan could fail at examination stage due to incomplete evidence.• Needed to proactively seek support from locals and membership from groups that represent the wider community - businesses, community groups, schools.	

- The purpose of the Neighbourhood Plan was not to block growth but to support growth, with the minimum growth being the amount set out in the Core Strategy. Business and Employment growth and not just dwellings.
- Strong encouragement to work with identified developers at an early stage to influence their decision making over sites. It was better to talk to developers about preferred sites etc rather than leaving them alone.
- Communication and engagement should cover all demographics and if this was not done properly it would be rejected, as the evidence base could be failed by the inspector.
- Grant funding was running out at national level. CTC monies expired in October 2014 although CTC would be asking for an extension.
- Keep a detailed record on activities and time undertaken by staff and volunteers as this could be used as donations-in-kind and be counted as part of the match funding.
- When asked for an estimate of timing for a small town plan to complete a Neighbourhood Plan, the response was 12 to 18 months from designation to adoption.

Members discussed the above and agreed that more needed to be done to:

- Involve additional members of the community.
 - a) Find more community members for the group
 - b) Send letters home with the school children
 - c) Write to members of the local business and traveller community asking for input
 - d) Approach youth groups for participants
 - e) Approach businesses at Chelworth
 - f) Seek opinion of WC Traveller Officer on best way to approach traveller community members
 - g) Define a general vision using previous work from the Town Plan.

It was agreed that following the positive feedback from the session from CRJ and RS that Towns Alive be invited to provide a quotation for assisting with some of the outstanding actions.

b. Highways meeting in March 2014

Members were still waiting for the release of the notes by WC officers. HT would chase up as would MC.

5. TO CONSIDER:

a. Project Plan and Tasks List

DT explained the importance of the tasks being completed and being reviewed.

Responses were required from:

- Festival – CRJ
- Work Experience – CRJ
- School Visits - MC with CRJ
- Leisure Centre Groups ?
- Business contacts – MC with CRJ

It is necessary to identify people for each task and ensure that they work to the prescribed time line. CRJ was requested to send the template issues log to other members of the group for them to complete. Best approach would be for the Chairmen of the individual focus groups to complete.

RS

HT and MC

DT

CRJ
MC
CRJ

CRJ

<p>b. Questions for Facebook The page was established but CRJ wary of negative comments and the workload in responding to enquiries. Questions could focus on the Vision – what is your vision for Cricklade? FB could be used to find new members for the group. DT offered to be the deputy editor of the page.</p>	<p>CRJ All to assist</p>
<p>c. Engagement with Young People CRJ suggested that Joshua, who did his Work Experience in the office, be invited to join the working party.</p>	<p>CRJ</p>
<p>6. OUTSTANDING ISSUES: a. Consultation Summary MC had undertaken an extensive piece of work and it would be emailed to the group for comments. TR thanked MC for his contribution.</p>	<p>MC</p>
<p>b. Scout Summary – complete</p>	
<p>c. Issues Log It was agreed that the raw data from the 2013 survey would need to be compiled into its own report as evidence for the examiner. Issues raised would be transferred to the issues log, initially completed by the Chairmen of the Focus Groups. CRJ offered to produce a community engagement plan.</p>	<p>All CRJ</p>
<p><i>(At this point BJ left the meeting)</i></p>	
<p>7. TO CONSIDER A MEETING WITH BEECHCROFT The proposed meeting to discuss S106 suggestions had changed and so the meeting had been postponed until an agenda could be agreed. Members of the NPWP wished to have the meeting but agreed that the scope of the discussions should be considered as this would influence who needed to attend. After a discussion it was suggested that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All meetings of the NPWP should be held in public • It was agreed that the meeting with Beechcroft would be separate to a NPWP meeting and the reply should say that members of the NPWP were happy to meet but that the TORs of the WP have been amended to accommodate their request. 	<p>CRJ</p>
<p>8. TO RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON: a. Campus Activity (RS) Planning Applications would be prepared and submitted in the autumn 2014.</p>	
<p>b. Extra Care Facility (BJ) Nothing to report.</p>	
<p>c. Culverhay Steering Group (MC) Letters were being circulated to invite people to the consultation event on 16th July 2014. PB gave some outline plans of the development of Culverhay: 2 different options would deliver 35 or 50 additional homes and a provision for more bungalows.</p>	
<p>9. TO RECEIVE A BUDGET UPDATE Nothing to report. As no expenditure had been incurred and the NPWP was thinking of spending money elsewhere it would be necessary to ask if changes could be made to the grant application for both an extension and for money to be spent elsewhere.</p>	

10. SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

A discussion took place on whether it was necessary for CTC to undertake an SA. HT suggested that it would be dependent on whether CTC was relying on the WC site allocation DPD (development plan document), or deciding where development should be going itself. The NPWP had previously agreed that it would not be site specific with its site allocation and therefore the SA would be done by the developer and not the NPWP.

It was essential to have the vision and issues laid out and WC would be able to undertake a scoping exercise to decide if the SA needed to be undertaken. The group could always ask WC for an opinion on the vision.

The NPWP needed to do more work in relation to the issues detailed in the Core Strategy; this would lead to the decision of whether the SA needed to be completed. HT asked if the NPWP had given more consideration of the concerns over Chelworth Industrial Estate? It had not.

(John Coole left the meeting).

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

Members agreed that the PCT Committee could be asked if the meetings could be opened up to members of the public.

12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

As NPWP was now managing its own project without professional support, it could be asking the link officer for more information to help form the evidence base.

The Clerk was requested to produce meetings dates for the remainder of the year.

HT would update the group on the projected figures for growth.

12. DATES OF WORKING PARTY MEETINGS AT 6PM:

- Wednesday 30th July, Wednesday 27th August and Wednesday 17th September.

The meeting closed at 2030hrs.