

## Cricklade Neighbourhood Plan Working Party Meeting

### NOTES FROM THE MEETING

Wednesday 15<sup>th</sup> October 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: Tim Russell (TR), Carolyn Russell (CR), Chris Ball (CB), Phil Bowley (PB).  
Officers: Charlotte Rogers-Jones (Town Clerk, CRJ).

In attendance for item 2: Mr Simkins from RPS and Mr Thomas from Beechcroft Land, and Mr Woods from DPDS.

	ACTION
<p>The meeting was open to the public but none were present.</p> <p><b>1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> Received from David Tetlow, Lesley Cowley and John Harmer.</p> <p><b>2. OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WITH DEVELOPERS</b> The Chairman welcomed Chris Simkins and Ian Thomas to the meeting in relation to the application for development on land at the Forty.</p> <p>a. The guests confirmed that an appeal would take place on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2014. They welcomed the opportunity to speak to the meeting and were pleased that it was open to the public. Regardless of the outcome of the appeal, they would like to liaise with the council and the NPWP to ensure discussions took place about positive development in Cricklade. They recognised that it is late in the day to start the conversation but wanted to have positive discussions.</p> <p>b. The meeting reminded the visitors that in early 2013 the site had not been recognised as a SHLAA site and yet discussions have already taken place with Wiltshire Council about Section 106 contributions, with a possible contribution towards the recreation facilities in town, without considering the view of CTC. The visitors confirmed that this was the case and that while the agreement had not been signed it was essential to have that agreement in place with Wiltshire Council in advance of the appeal. The S106 contribution must be linked to the development and must satisfy the Inspector.</p> <p><b>c. Questions were raised as follows;</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Why speak to the council now and what were they hoping to gain? There was concern that the outline planning application and the final drawings will not be related and that CTC would have no input into the number of style of houses.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Response was that it was essential to engage with the NP process and this was an opportunity to talk about specifics on the site.</li></ul></li><li>• Where would the affordable houses be located?<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ There would be a specific amount of affordable housing that met the criteria as laid down in the Core Strategy.</li></ul></li><li>• Why were they planning to build on fields that flooded?<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ If the developer thought that there was a risk of flooding then they would not build, but the flooding in these fields could be dealt with through drainage and ditch improvement. They had been in contact with the Wiltshire Council drainage engineer and they had made a commitment to unblock the ditches and implement a drainage strategy. Some of the water is standing water (pluvial) and measures would be put in place for a</li></ul></li></ul>	

## sustainable drainage plan

- Why had the developer chosen that site over others that are listed as SHLAA sites?
  - An opportunity had been presented by the landowner and considering the sustainability of the site, access and the relation to the town centre they were presented with a development that fitted with the size and scale of Cricklade.
- What about pedestrian access to the town centre? Was a link being created from the forty to the town centre?
  - A new footpath was being created along the verge on the Purton Road but no path would be created onto the Forty. If it appears on the map as such, this is an existing house and not part of the development.
- Cllr Coole added that an access point onto the Forty was essential to give a safe route to school and without this the site would not be considered as meeting the needs of residents. Traffic on the Purton Road was substantial.

d. The guests asked if they could submit development information to the group for posting along other developer information on the NP website. *They left the meeting.*

*Mr and Mrs Russell asked that it formally be recorded in the notes that they did not raise any questions or concerns as they would be personally affected by the development.*

e. The Chairman welcomed Mr Woods from DPDs who was the agent for a proposed development at Stone's Farm/Reeds. BJ asked that it be noted that he owns a house in Reeds.

f. Mr Woods explained that the site for development was 2 separate sites; one containing the farmyard and associated farm house and buildings, the other being a greenfield site. An application for 15 dwelling in 2004 had been refused as there was no safe access to the site. That was now being addressed. The farmyard was within the settlement boundary and was classed as brown field and had potential for development.

g. Mr Woods appreciated the ranking order of supporting development from the town centre outwards but this was a good and large sustainable site, it could be landscaped with screening and would not impact on too many residents of Cricklade.

### **h. Questions were raised.**

- An application could be made for the farm land development anyway?
  - Mr Woods confirmed this and that that the access road was being considered by the highways engineers and the developer.
- Were they aware that there was a history of flooding in the area?
  - Response was they would be enhancing the drainage flood risk plan but that was not being done in detail at the current time.
- Were they aware that the Thames Path and a SSSI ran close to the boundary?
  - Yes, and landscaping would be done at an early stage to improve the buffer.
- What is the nature of the homes?
  - It would be a site of mixed housing, with a full range of units with affordable housing offered in accordance of the criteria of the Core Strategy. There would be starter homes through to 4 bed roomed homes on both sites. The previous application had contained 3 storey homes but

the urban designer had recognised that this was not appropriate for Cricklade and had indicated 2 storey homes only.

- Could the developer make improvements to Cricklade over and above the basic requirements as laid down by S106 and the Community Infrastructure Levy?
  - Mr Woods recognised that S106 money should be spent locally to enhance the development.
- How many houses would be on each site?
  - The farmyard could take approximately 15 and the greenfield site could accommodate up to 150 new homes, but work had not covered this level of detail at this stage.

i. The Chairman thanked Mr Woods for his presentation. *Mr Woods left the meeting.*

j. The Chairman informed the meeting that he had received an email from an agent from Bloor Homes, acting for the Horsey Down land and this had been circulated.

BJ confirmed that he was uncomfortable talking to developers and would prefer them to make written submissions. He suggested that developers be invited to speak at the beginning of the meeting then be invited to leave.

The SHLAA map was being updated by the PCT Committee.

**The Chairman suggested that the meeting order be changed to allow some people to leave early.**

### **3. PROGRESS WITH TOWNS ALIVE**

The NPWP, through delegated authority from the PCT committee, had allocated expenditure to Towns Alive to undertake support work to complete the NP. Now that the staff involved in Neighbourhood Planning no longer worked for Towns Alive, and had set up their own company called Plan-et, it would be necessary to consider the order being cancelled with Towns Alive and reallocated to Plan-Et. The work would be broken into smaller bundles with some of the money being spent by year end.

A recommendation was being submitted to an Extraordinary PCT meeting to ask that the NPWP be delegated authority to be more flexible in its approach to placing an order with the appropriate company; Then the NPWP could chose who it wished to complete the work.

*(Clerk's Note: Members of the Planning, Conservation and Transport Committee, as its meeting on Monday 20<sup>th</sup> October 2014, Resolved to delegate to the Neighbourhood Plan Working Party the authority to chose its own professional consultants to undertake the necessary support work to complete the Neighbourhood Plan).*

### **4. TO APPROVE NOTES FROM THE MEETING HELD ON 17<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2014**

These notes were approved.

### **5. TO CONSIDER ACTION POINTS FROM MEETING HELD ON 17<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2014**

- Publication of meeting dates to go on the website
- All notes to be passed to DT to go on website
- Letter to school parents – on hold
- Leisure centre and communications strategy – outstanding
- Facebook content – part of the order with TA, ongoing as part of this order
- Community Engagement Plan – Clerk to update
- Highways Appendix for Draft Plan – TR to produce by Easter 2015
- Settlement Boundary Review Consultation – complete
- Housing Site Selection Criteria – issues identified and emailed to Wiltshire Council

- Project Plan – DT on holiday
- Towns Alive – see item 3 above
- First Consultation report – emailed out and waiting for comments

## **6. UPDATES**

### **a. CAMPUS UPDATE**

Pre-planning consultation would run from 22<sup>nd</sup> October to 5<sup>th</sup> November. Display would be available at the Leisure Centre, in the town council offices and on a WC trailer.

### **b. EXTRA CARE UPDATE**

A report had been circulated.

### **c. CULVERHAY STEERING GROUP UPDATE**

PB reported that the pre planning application was with WC planning department. Feedback would be received from them and the highways department and there would need to be a further consultation with these amendments. Then detailed work will be undertaken on specific homes and relocations. Traffic surveys are also being undertaken. It is likely that outline planning permission would be sought in Spring 2015.

Green Square would need to sell off some of the homes on the open market in order to provide affordable homes and there could be an opportunity for further talks with the other developers to ensure that affordable and accessible homes were provided across town.

## **7. CONSULTATION SUMMARY**

The meeting agreed to consider the list of criteria for housing allocation and provide a response to WC by January 2015. In order to seek public opinion though it was necessary to consult the public.

Suggestions included:

- What factors needed to be considered if we expand the town outside the existing settlement boundary? – Q3.4 Issue Identification – Housing
- What views do you have about the style, type and density of development of new homes which would be acceptable? Q3.5 Issue Identification – Housing

These questions could go out in a brief questionnaire, 1 per house, in school bags and on survey monkey. Ask for a postcode to ensure that they are responded by Cricklade residents. There was a discussion on this and it was agreed that a questionnaire be designed that contained these 2 questions, to go out in November. MC agreed to condense the questions, to liaise with the graphic designer and email other members of the group for opinion.

## **8. PROJECT PLAN AND TASKS LIST – nothing to report**

## **9. BUDGET UPDATE - £480 has been spent with Towns Alive.**

## **10. ITEMS FOR PCT - Nothing to add**

## **11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

It was suggested that the group meet more frequently and that in 2015 it meets every 2 weeks. The Clerk was asked to prepare meeting dates for 2015.

## **12. DATES OF WORKING PARTY MEETINGS (WEDNESDAY AT 6PM) :**

29<sup>th</sup> October, 12<sup>th</sup> November and 10<sup>th</sup> December 2014.

The meeting closed at 8.05pm