

Cricklade Neighbourhood Plan Working Party Meeting

NOTES FROM THE MEETING

Wednesday 27th August 2014 at 6pm in the Town Council Chamber

NPWP Members Present:

Councillors: Mark Clarke (MC), John Coole (JC), Ruth Szybiak (RS), Sue Holbrook (SH), Bob Jones (BJ)

Community Members: Lesley Cowley (LC), John Harmer (JH), Tim Russell (TR), David Tetlow (DT), Tim Russell (TR), Carolyn Russell (CR), Chris Ball (CB)

Town Clerk: Charlotte Rogers-Jones

	ACTION
<p>Although none were present MC confirmed the meeting was open to the public. The best method of publicising meetings had not been decided. The latest Chronicle (September) would contain time and place of the next meeting. TR asked if meetings could be also publicised on the Town Council website – this was agreed.</p>	MC/CRJ
<p>1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE Received from Phil Bowley</p>	
<p>2. TO APPROVE THE NOTES FROM THE MEETINGS HELD ON 30th JULY 2014 AND 12th AUGUST 2014 In notes of 30/07/2014 DT asked for 3.4a(iv) last three bullets the phrase “and a SWOT analysis undertaken” be deleted. Options needed to be identified for each issue before this could be done, yet the issues list had not yet been completed. The action from last meeting was only to analyse the issues. Meeting agreed to this amendment.</p> <p>There were no other changes requested</p>	MC/CRJ
<p>3. TO CONSIDER: a. Action Points from 30/07/2014 notes: School correspondence outstanding: this is to be a letter to parents seek more engagement from the 20-30 age group. To be done in September 2014.</p>	MC/CRJ
<p>i. Leisure Centre LC suggested a Communications Strategy was needed to set out what was intended to be achieved from this action point. This should start by replaying what had already been said so people who had already made comments knew they had been heard. LC offered to draft a document to be considered – this was accepted.</p>	LC
<p>ii. Facebook MC asked that Facebook publicise Working Party meetings were open to the public.</p> <p>TR suggested seeking suggestions for a strapline for the the plan. LC felt there needed to be a clear “vision” set out first reflecting what had already been said. MC suggested using the Q19 analysis as a starting point. CR said that it seemed a good start to suggest “Cricklade’s character to be cherished and maintained”. BJ said it was important not to “lead the witness”. Agreed MC and LC to draw out what had already been said and play this back to people as the starting point.</p>	CRJ LC/MC
<p>iii. Young People Joshua would like to join but is waiting on permission from his parents. CRJ to continue to liaise with him. He could be an observer rather than a full member.</p>	CRJ
<p>iv. Issues Log</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open Space and Business had been completed • Housing remained outstanding and was now critical path. 	MC/JC
<p>iv. Community Engagement Plan CRJ had been maintaining log of engagement to date . LC to liaise with CRJ over future engagement plan.</p>	LC/CRJ
<p>b. The Project Plan and Tasks List – separate agenda item</p>	
<p>c. Questions for Facebook See above 3a(ii).</p>	
<p>d. Engagement with young people See above 3a and 3a(iii).</p>	
<p>e. Consultation Summary MC undertook that this would be completed by 2 September.</p> <p>There was discussion on disclosure of landowner communication. Meeting agreed that identities and specific land owned should be disclosed even where there had been no feedback to date because this would be a way of identifying any errors. Letters had been sent in good faith. Land ownership should be in public domain.</p>	MC
<p>Question 19 analysis now completed so could be included.</p>	MC
<p>f. Meeting with Beechcroft CRJ said there had been no progress since last meeting owing to holidays but she was continuing to pursue a date to meet.</p>	CRJ
<p>g. Notes of meeting between NPWP members and WC Highways TR to write Appendix for the Draft Plan based on outcome of the meeting.</p>	TR
<p>h. Proposal From Towns Alive – separate agenda item</p> <p>CRJ had oral feedback from Common Places that there would be no charge from cancelling the order for a Sustainability Appraisal. This would need formal notice to cancel after approval from PCT to be firm.</p>	CRJ
<p>i. Site Allocations And Boundary Review Consultation – separate agenda item</p>	
<p>4. PROJECT PLAN AND TASK LISTS DT said he and MC would now meet weekly to maintain momentum by pursuing actions between meetings and sending chasing emails.</p>	MC/DT
<p>Critical path items were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Housing Issues List (prior to combined issues list removing duplicates). Agreed this would be completed and circulated by end of next week (5 September) - Then refine issues prior to looking at options first to remove duplicates then refine, as not necessary to look at options for issues that were minor (e.g. one respondent) or going to be disregarded for options analysis (noting such issues may be in final Draft Plan) – this to be done as a group - Therefore need to start thinking about what was going to be in Draft Plan as this would help crystallise issues and create target. Noted that examples to date were all different so we needed consensus on what Cricklade’s Plan would look like. Suggested Towns Alive could help by proposing model Plan. 	MC/JC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Gap Filling” important but it was could be undertaken in parallel 	RS/CRJ

<p>DT repeated need to allocate “NWP” actions in project plan to individuals.</p> <p>Immediate requirement was to achieve issues list and prioritise – agreed at last meeting that ex-Chairs of Focus Groups would meet to create draft for consideration. Agreed LC should also be present owing to her recent involvement in analysing Q19. This activity to be done by next NPWP meeting. [Post meeting note – meeting agreed for 5:30pm on Monday 15 September 2014]</p>	<p>DT/MC/ JC/CB/ LC</p>
<p>5. TOWNS ALIVE PROPOSAL</p> <p>RS was keen to use grant money before it expired on activities that NPWP members were struggling with in order to help move the Plan forward. It was necessary for Towns Alive (TA) to review work to date first. The first task was to complete the form that would allow use of grant on a different activity from the Sustainability Appraisal. The second task was to provide a model Plan (see above). Then TA could identify work that TA could help with to achieve the Draft Plan.</p>	<p>CRJ</p>
<p>BJ noted it was essential TA had a full summary of work done to date. This would require completion of the Consultation Report document. MC undertook to complete this by 2 September. TR asked for TA to have the Town Plan.</p>	<p>MC</p>
<p>Despite absences of many NPWP members it was agreed TA meeting was only a review session and it was critical to have the meeting asap therefore the proposed date of 11:30am on 10 September was agreed – CRJ/RS to confirm with TA.</p>	<p>RS/CRJ</p>
<p>6. SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY REVIEW CONSULTATION – RESPONSE TO WILTSHIRE COUNCIL</p>	
<p>Hard copy of the draft formal response prepared by LC and JH (following 12 August meeting) was circulated for comment prior to it going to PCT for formal approval.</p>	<p>CRJ</p>
<p>LC highlighted an omission in answer to Q1 item 2 which she would correct.</p>	<p>LC</p>
<p>TR noted that Q4 asked for timescales of boundary revision and therefore asked that the response included a target date for completion by the NPWP of the criteria that would be applied to new housing development. He suggested January 2015 per his earlier email circulated to NPWP members. It was agreed this was a reasonable target and so this should be added to the paragraph answering Q5.</p>	<p>LC</p>
<p>It was noted that the NPWP had targeted achieving weighting of criteria by 2 September and would not meet this deadline. It was agreed TA would be asked specifically to assist with this task. MC deferred discussion on this to AOB.</p>	<p>RS/CRJ</p>
<p>TR asked that his request for a boundary for Chelworth should be more clearly included in the response (as had been agreed at 12 August meeting). JC felt that a map should be sent with the boundary/ies drawn around what was there and/or approved and offered to do this with support from BJ. The map could not be provided in time for approval by next PCT and the subsequent PCT would occur after the formal date for closure of consultation. It was agreed that the response would note preparation of a map was in progress and the map would be sent as soon as possible after the consultation closing date.</p>	<p>JC/BJ</p> <p>LC JC</p>
<p>TR clarified that we were not asking for a separate status for Chelworth but rather it was to be considered as part of the Cricklade settlement, with its own boundary.</p>	
<p>7. UPDATES ON RELATED ACTIVITIES</p> <p>a. Campus</p>	

<p>RS reported that a planning application was now due to be submitted in October. A final meeting with the architect was scheduled for 4 September and this would be followed by extensive consultation (with assistance from the Area Board).</p>	
<p>b. Extra Care Facility No progress since last NPWP meeting. Russell Batten of WC had been asked by MC for a non-confidential briefing update that could be passed to residents but he was currently on holiday. MC to chase.</p>	MC
<p>c. Culverhay Steering Group No update since last NPWP meeting.</p>	
<p>8. BUDGET UPDATE No expenditure to note.</p>	
<p>9. RECOMMENDATIONS TO PCT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Settlement Boundary Review Consultation Response to approve (ii) Towns Alive spend to approve (iii) Note that map showing proposed Chelworth boundary would be provided for approval on 22 September 	JC/CRJ
<p>10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS</p>	
<p>a. Housing Site Selection Criteria MC referred to February 2014 document setting out 11 criteria (and the number of times these were mentioned) that resulted from April 2013 consultation which he had re-circulated by email with last meeting's notes.</p>	
<p>MC asked what NPWP members thought was meant by "Infrastructure" as this was vague and did not seem to relate to site selection. Agreed that it depended on whether it was site specific (e.g. local drainage) or general (e.g. school space).</p>	
<p>TR said clarification of criteria needed to be the subject of another consultation and noted one was pencilled in for the autumn. There needed to be a task on someone to design a consultation format that got a large number of responses to this issue but did not "lead the witness" so results could be considered robust. DT said the necessary process was similar to that proposed for the Issues List. TR/JH reiterated the suggestion of asking Towns Alive for specific advice for this task – it was agreed TA would be asked to quote for this at the "checkpoint meeting" on 10 September. CRJ reminded the meeting of restrictions around the grant timing.</p>	MC
<p>MC agreed to refine criteria list with number of responses to improve clarity.</p>	MC
<p>RS suggested piggy backing on the Campus consultation, which may include a "library van" parked in different streets around the town. She would investigate at meeting on 4 September. LC reiterated it was important to set out what people had already said before asking them for more.</p>	RS
<p>b. Allocation of "NWP" Tasks in Project Plan to Individuals Agreed that identification of Options could not be allocated until the Issues List had been completed.</p>	
<p>The problem of engaging with the 12-21 age group was discussed, specifically the issue of Cricklade young people being dispersed around several secondary schools. CR suggested asking for a questionnaire to be put on the individual schools websites. LC suggested asking TA for the best method to access this group – this may not be a questionnaire. TR clarified there were two tasks: one was about</p>	

<p>general planning targeted at young people the other was specific housing criteria.</p> <p>RS/DT said the two problems were (i) communicating back and (ii) demonstrating we had identified all the issues raised by the community across all demographics.</p> <p>We may think we have all issues but we do not have the data to support this. BJ said that quantity of responses may not be relevant if those that were received were representative. . TR repeated his offer to compare results from the Town Plan consultation with those on Neighbourhood Planning, to establish whether there was consistency. Even if there may be common respondents the volume of responses was much higher for the Town Plan. This was not decided.</p> <p>In order to use Campus consultation period and capture the wider demographic expected to respond to that, a bullet point list of points to feed back and associated questionnaire would need to be completed by mid-September. DT said it was important to get feedback from TA as to whether the demographic “gap” was fatal or whether what we had already was sufficient. However TR said we should not assume this. DT agreed we should aim to use the Campus consultation opportunity</p> <p>LC was asked to do the bullet point list of issues and agreed to do this by 10 September but only after the overall Communications Strategy was completed.</p> <p>Agreed to defer other “NWP” task allocation to subsequent meetings.</p> <p>DT repeated the need to have an idea of the structure of the final Plan document in order to frame activity towards a defined objective. Agreed that this should come from TA delivering a model structure. Agreed that the discussion over the model structure provided at the TA meeting attended by RS and CRJ should be an agenda item at next NPWP on 17 September.</p> <p>Agreed TA should be asked to come on 10 September specifically with:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. a model structure suitable for Cricklade’s Plan ii. how to frame a questionnaire that captured community views on criteria for new housing location etc. iii. how to engage with a younger demographic (other methods than questionnaires) <p>JC suggested using the electoral role to identify who is approaching 18 as a means of directly accessing the 16-17 year olds. BJ said this specific idea should be put to TA for their advice before it was implemented.</p> <p>The meeting closed at 19:40hrs.</p> <p>Next meetings: 17th September 15th October 12th November 10th December</p>	<p>LC</p> <p>RS/CRJ</p> <p>RS/CRJ</p> <p>RS/CRJ</p>
--	---