

Cricklade Neighbourhood Plan Working Party Meeting

NOTES FROM THE MEETING

Wednesday 17th September 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), David Tetlow (DT)

	ACTION
<p>The meeting was open to the public but none were present.</p> <p>1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE Received from Carolyn Russell (CR), Tim Russell (TR), Chris Ball (CB), Joshua Coombes, Charlotte Rogers-Jones (CRJ)</p> <p>2. TO APPROVE NOTES FROM MEETING HELD ON 27th AUGUST 2014 Version circulated with agenda was approved.</p> <p>3. TO CONSIDER Action Points from 27/08/2014 notes:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">i. Publication of Meetings No-one present could confirm if meeting had been publicised on Town Council website. To confirm if action outstanding.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">ii. Correction of 30/07/14 Notes DT said he had not received approved notes from some prior meetings (including the last) for publication on website and had emailed a reminder to CRJ. MC to liaise with CRJ to bring website record up to date.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">iii. Letter to School Parents Remains outstanding pending clarity on what is being requested – see later.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">iv. Leisure Centre LC said she had noted the Communications Strategy was a part of the scope of work with Towns Alive and therefore had not pursued this. LC said she had agreed that the document replaying what had already been said in consultation was to follow on so had not been started. This therefore remained outstanding.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">v. Facebook There had been no publication of the current meeting on Facebook. MC to request this happens in future.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">vi. Young People Joshua would normally attend as observer but sent his apologies to this meeting.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">vii. Issues Log Covered as agenda item.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">viii. Community Engagement Plan CRJ had been maintaining log of engagement to date. Ongoing action. Future engagement plan to be part of scope with TA.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">ix. Consultation Summary Covered as agenda item.</p>	<p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p>MC/CRJ</p> <p>MC/CRJ</p> <p>MC/CRJ</p> <p>LC</p> <p>MC/CRJ</p> <p></p> <p></p> <p>CRJ LC/CRJ</p>

<p>x. Meeting with Beechcroft JC reported that there had been some exchanges but CRJ had been unable to agree a mutually acceptable date to meet. JC expressed concern that it was now not appropriate as Beechcroft had submitted an appeal for the specific site south of The Forty. It was noted that Beechcroft had initially requested the meeting and the lack of enthusiasm to get a date suggested they now did not seem to want to meet.</p> <p>JC wondered if the Cricklade NP was far enough advanced to be considered a material consideration in the way that Malmesbury’s had been in a similar recent appeal. However he felt the NPWP should submit its own response to the Appeal Inspector independent of the Town Council. This request was considered under the Developer Update agenda item.</p>	
<p>xi. Notes of meeting between NPWP members and WC Highways TR to write Appendix for the Draft Plan – action outstanding but not critical path.</p>	TR
<p>xii. Cancellation of Common Places Order MC confirmed this had been done and there would be no charge.</p>	
<p>xiii. Project Plan and Task Lists MC said he and DT continued to meet weekly – this was a separate agenda item.</p>	
<p>xiv. Issues List/Meeting Meeting had been held following completion of draft issues lists from each Focus Group and Q19. Separate agenda item.</p>	
<p>xv. Towns Alive Proposal Meeting had been held with TA and the response from that circulated hence a separate agenda item.</p>	
<p>xvi. Settlement Boundary Review Consultation Response had been approved by PCT and was with CRJ for submission prior to Monday deadline. The map of the Chelworth Area was to be covered as AOB.</p>	CRJ
<p>xvii. Extra Care Facility No progress. Action to obtain non confidential briefing update outstanding.</p>	MC
<p>xviii. Housing Site Selection Criteria TA had not directly covered the action to provide specific advice in their proposal therefore this action outstanding.</p>	MC/TA
<p>MC had not yet refined criteria list with number of responses.</p> <p>The idea to piggy back the Campus consultation was covered as separate item.</p>	MC
<p>xix. List of Issues for Next Consultation LC had not progressed – this was to be part of TA scope – covered below.</p>	LC/TA
<p>a. Issues Identification Reports The four issues lists (Open Space, Housing, Business/Transport and Q19) had been circulated. MC thanked those who had put considerable effort into putting these together. He noted there were many issues which were raised in only one response, with only a few raised across multiple responses.</p> <p>BJ suggested lists should be “sanitised” to remove issues that could not be addressed through a NP. MC explained that had been the purpose of the meeting on the prior Monday but had been overtaken by the proposal from TA. It was now</p>	

considered that possibly TA would be best placed to do that work.

4. PROJECT PLAN AND TASKS LIST

DT had circulated Excel summary highlighting those tasks now overdue. DT expected it would change significantly after input from TA so had not updated it much since the prior version. New tasks to prepare and print the Consultation Report had been added. The school letter drop had been amplified into several tasks with no names or dates. Tasks requiring consultation on Building Design Code and housing mix also added.

DT noted it had been reviewed superficially by TA and no material comments had been made yet i.e. the things that needed work now (gap filling and issues analysis) were probably correct. Specifically it was highlighted there had been no progress on gap filling since the last meeting and this was essential before other tasks could be progressed. It was hoped TA would come up with specific proposals for getting feedback from e.g. businesses and travellers as part of an overarching communications strategy. It appeared this could be achieved quite quickly based on the TA budgeted time allocation.

5. TOWNS ALIVE PROPOSAL

MC reported that Alison Eardley (AE) from TA had met NPWP representatives in Cricklade on 10 September for a session lasting over 3 hours. After reviewing Cricklade's progress (including prior review of website, project plan and other documents) it was agreed she would submit a proposal setting out how TA could help expedite the process.

DT noted that a gap AE had identified was a "State of Town" of "Position Statement" that documented in one place all the factual evidence (e.g. census, housing needs survey, etc.) available. This would be taken together with the feedback from consultation to form the basis of issues that led to NP policies.

BJ said it was the first time what needed to be done had been clearly set out. MC said they benefitted from experience working on other NPs and this was what was wanted here. This gave confidence that TA could deliver what Cricklade needed.

JH agreed that the advice was clear and that the proposal had arrived in a very timely way allowing it to be fully considered prior to the current meeting.

RS asked if they had the capacity to deliver for Cricklade in addition to other work. It was noted that only two individuals were directly named, but there was mention of other members within TA who could be drawn in. Resourcing needed to be clarified before the proposal was accepted.

JH noted that the issues report for the NEWV NP prepared by Common Places showed only 84 respondents to Purton's consultation meaning only about half the number of people in the 20-29 age group had responded to Purton's consultation compared with Cricklade, and only two thirds the total overall from a similar population size within each parish. BJ said in that context Cricklade was not doing too badly.

LC said it was important to put in "gates" to be able to monitor TA performance against objectives and so be able to manage both cost and output effectively. MC agreed and also noted that much of the background work had been done already by the NPWP and so he thought some of the scope could be reduced once detailed discussion on that took place with TA. However DT said it appeared to him there was still a lot of work the NPWP would need to do – it wasn't TA doing it instead but rather setting out what needed to be done.

LC/TA

LC/MC

For example DT took the Position Statement and said it wasn't clear what scope the 2 estimated days from TA covered. Similarly the Engagement/ Communications Strategy had an option with a clear difference in scope in it.

JH asked for TA to be more specific in tying in their proposed tasks with the Project Plan because it appeared they were only budgeting five working weeks of their time before a Draft Plan would be available and reiterated that there needed to be more clarity on who within TA would actually be doing the work.

MC asked if other organisations should be considered for the work, though noting the time limitation on the DCLG grant and the benefit from using that money to move the NP process forward alongside the committed budget allocated by CTC.

RS suggested asking TA to undertake a limited scope to prove themselves without overcommitting CTC if TA did not prove satisfactory. This should limit the questions that TA needed to answer before they were asked to start work. This principle was agreed.

After discussion it was agreed that TA would be asked to undertake work in the proposal up to and including analysis of engagement data and determining listing of key issues (halfway down p2) and approval sought from PCT for this. BJ queried if there was sufficient money in the budget for this. MC confirmed there was. DT said he wanted to see earlier results than this from TA's work – this was supported. LC said this scope would still need significant input from NPWP members – this was noted.

SH asked if a consultant could write the NP or whether it had to be done by the community. MC said all the plans he had seen had been done by consultants including the Woodcote Plan which had been recommended as a template by AE.

It was noted AE had recommended Woodcote because it had few policies. SH said she had read it and it was very impressive because it was so detailed and thorough especially site analysis for new homes. She felt it left nothing left to ask however it was not clear how much work had been grant funded consultants and how much by community.

BJ queried whether it would need another meeting with AE/TA to agree the scope. It was noted AE came from Kent and worked remotely as TA was based in Bury St Edmunds therefore this was not cost effective – it had been important to meet once but subsequent contact was best done by phone/email.

JH asked if the scope would include the management of press and social media and if so who was going to manage TA's input on that. MC said someone needed to go through the TA scope and clarify what had already been done and what therefore remained for TA to do. The scope needed to be clarified before it could be taken to PCT for approval.

RS wanted to ensure the NPWP understood what TA were being asked to do so that people were not disappointed with what came back. Although they were only asking to be paid for work done there was a danger in tasks taking longer than budgeted in order to be done to a standard that the NPWP expected and it was important to get clarity on this up front.

LC agreed to act as point of liaison with TA, clarify the initial scope of work into something that could be taken to PCT (specifically resolving all "or's") and say we were minded to give them the full scope but would only commit to the first phase.

MC

LC

BJ suggested seeking approval from PCT to spend the full quote i.e. a sum not exceeding £9,100 to provide flexibility in progressing the NP forward from here. This was agreed.

JC

6. PROPOSAL TO PROFESSIONALLY PRESENT FIRST CONSULTATION REPORT

MC felt the Consultation Report was sufficiently important that it needed to look good and had received a quote of £125 from Alison Fisher (who had produced the initial NP graphics) to improve the presentation of the document. DT said it was important to preserve style consistency across documents. It was agreed Alison should be asked to do this provided PCT gave its approval. This would be brought to Monday's PCT meeting.

MC/JC

MC noted the cost of print runs was high for low volumes of copies. He had been quoted and estimated £5/copy for 48 sides and the document currently had 60 sides. LC asked that it should be put in pdf form so that it could be uploaded to the web and printed elsewhere. This was agreed. BJ said he could print out copies at cost using a business printer and estimated this would be £3/copy. CTC could also produce small numbers of printed copies.

MC

7a. CAMPUS UPDATE

RS said the SCOB hoped to finalise the Stone's Lane plan at a meeting on 25th September and hoped to be consulting on this during October. JH said the key issue for the NPWP was timing and using the same consultation period to do gap filling and letting AE/TA know this. RS said she would do what she could to confirm method and timing but this was in the hands of Wiltshire Council.

RS

7b. EXTRA CARE UPDATE

BJ had nothing to report as no meeting had taken place since the last NPWP.

RS

7c. CULVERHAY STEERING GROUP UPDATE

The next Steering Group meeting was 26th September and MC expected an update from that. SH said a GreenSquare newsletter had been dropped through Culverhay residents' doors setting out the two options for redevelopment.

7d. DEVELOPER UPDATE

JC felt that the NPWP should make an independent submission to the appeal setting out where Cricklade had reached in its NP process so as not to cloud a response from CTC which would go into detail on the specific site issues. MC noted that Malmesbury did have someone from its NP Steering Group speak at appeals in addition to Town Councillors.

DT/RS asked if the NPWP had a view that it could submit about the specific site. JC said the NPWP should at least say it is considering sites. JH said he thought the NPWP could say only where it was in the process. The more relevant issue was the Settlement Boundary Review (SBR). Cricklade's response had gone forward in the name of CTC not the NPWP even though the NPWP had put in the work because the NPWP was a Working Party under the authorised body which was the Town Council. The difference between Malmesbury and Cricklade was that Malmesbury had a multi parish NP whereas Cricklade's was a single parish NP. JH felt the NPWP should state via PCT that it had input to the SBR and that consideration of any site outside the existing SB was premature before WC had completed the review work. The NPWP had decided so far that it would not talk about specific site allocations therefore it could not comment on this site. RS said the NPWP could say the site may be sub-optimal because there were other options that WC would consider and the community had not yet had the opportunity to

consider those other options through the NP process.

JH said that CTC/NPWP could evidence the work being done by GreenSquare on Culverhay and their intent to submit a planning application there which would deliver a material number of additional housing units within Cricklade. It was premature to say how many more additional houses Cricklade may need to find and there was no need to solve this urgently to meet the trajectory to 2026.

JC said he had not seen the grounds for appeal and did not know whether a further submission was needed to challenge what had been said by the developer. BJ said these were available on the web.

It was agreed PCT would make Cricklade's response referencing the input from the NPWP noting the NPWP would not meet again until after the closing date for appeal submissions.

BJ asked if the public should be told. It was noted that all members of the public who had commented had been notified by WC directly.

8. BUDGET UPDATE

MC said he was not aware of any spend since last meeting.

9. ITEMS FOR PCT

1. Towns Alive Spend Approval
2. Alison Fisher Spend Approval
3. NPWP Input to Beechcroft Appeal submission.

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

10.1 Chelworth

JC produced 3 maps showing the approximate extent of development at Chelworth beyond that which had been planned. It had proved very difficult from maps provided identifying precise extent. Most was unauthorised prior to development but had been legitimised by retrospective application or certificate of lawfulness. These showed the industrialised area had almost doubled since 2006 (when the North Wilts Local Plan had been published).

JC asked that the NPWP approve submitting the three maps via PCT to the SBR. LC said that the extent of expansion justified it being included in the SBR. MC expressed concern that drawing a boundary and declaring inside it to be industrial land could lead to change of use applications that would relax existing restrictions so worsen the situation. Although restrictions applied within other boundaries, the history at Chelworth was that these were routinely flouted and enforcement had been non-existent or inadequate.

DT said he understood that planning rules prohibit development in the open countryside and hence it was not necessary to draw a boundary to restrict further expansion of Chelworth since any extension would be into open countryside. The issue was one of enforcement. JH agreed and said the issue had come up at the workshop on the SBR which he and CB attended: there should be no development therefore a boundary was unnecessary. JC said he had received contrary feedback from a planning officer some years ago which was that a boundary would be helpful to contain the expansion. LC suggested it was best to sit with the existing planners, show them the situation and ask them what to do about it rather than force through a formal process. MC agreed it was best to work with WC planners. Brian Taylor was due to visit PCT on the Monday and could be asked then whether it would help or hinder to have a line drawn around the Chelworth

JC

JC
JC
JC

area. It appeared too easy without a line to simply expand the existing industrial area by “just another unit” – indeed it was noted this had already happened with previous applications.

There was discussion over whether it would be beneficial to have Chelworth classified as a Small Village within the Core Strategy. The meeting was unclear whether this was possible and what the implications would be. It was suggested Brian Taylor could be asked this as well.

RS asked whether it would be possible to limit the type of businesses that could get permission within a boundary if that were drawn. The big issue was the vehicle movements and so businesses that offered little employment but a lot of HGV traffic were not suitable. It was noted that warehousing businesses were particularly unsuitable. JH said it was important to keep growth of business and residential in balance.

It was confirmed that no action resulted from the NPWP and the issue of what to submit to WC was left to PCT.

10.2 Contacting Young People

DT asked about the effectiveness of contacting teenagers via the electoral roll and if TA had been asked for advice. MC said they had not and would email AE with the question, specifically the legality of using the full roll which was available to CTC. JH said it was a data protection question and TA may not be the best people to ask about legality.

MC

SH said she had done an ad hoc survey in Culverhay about the best way to engage with younger people. Half would like it on Facebook and the other half would prefer a piece of paper through their door. Most claimed they were unaware that their opinion would be valued. MC said the letter to schools was intended to assist this communication but the NPWP needed to be clear what it was asking and make the most of the opportunity rather than send two letters in quick succession.

The meeting closed at 19:30hrs.

Next meetings: 15th October
12th November
10th December