

Cricklade Neighbourhood Plan Working Party Meeting

NOTES FROM THE MEETING

Wednesday 4th February 2015 at 6pm in the Town Council Chamber

NPWP Members Present:

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

Community Members: Lesley Cowley (LC), Tim Russell (TR), David Tetlow (DT)

	ACTION
<p>1. Apologies for absence Received from Chris Ball (CB) and Phil Bowley (PB). BJ/DT noted they needed to leave the meeting early.</p>	
<p>2. To approve the notes from the meeting held on 7th January 2015. The notes were approved.</p>	
<p>3. To consider the Action points from the 7th January meeting</p> <p>a. Notes of 10th December meeting were formally approved.</p>	
<p>b. Link Officer: MC had received an email on 15th January which noted the difficulty WC were having resourcing Neighbourhood Planning: there were 26 active NP groups and more seeking designation, therefore there was no one else immediately available to support Cricklade, but WC confirmed they were seeking a solution. MC undertook to chase WC for progress. TR noted the need for someone from WC at meetings now the NPWP work was looking at drafting policies, either in person or by teleconference. MC would raise this specifically.</p>	MC
<p>c. Next Steps following Second Public Consultation MC had cleaned the dataset as agreed and it had been circulated. The graphs showed the number of responses to each specific sub-bullet.</p> <p>A two line update had been made in the Chronicle and Ripples magazines but not yet put on Facebook. DT reiterated his ongoing need to be sent such communications formally to put on the website before they appeared in print.</p> <p>TR had circulated a map of Cricklade to most NPWP members showing responses by postcode. Those who had not seen it were forwarded the email during the meeting.</p> <p>MC had not yet circulated the letter from a resident sent in response to consultation but noted it mainly concerned housing issues and so should most appropriately be considered when framing housing policies.</p> <p>The Housing Workshop had taken place.</p> <p>The draft preamble to the Plan remained outstanding.</p> <p>Other actions were covered as agenda items.</p>	MC
<p>4. Next Steps Following Housing Workshop It was agreed the session was useful and made a good start but much needed still to be done. MC suggested taking actions forward at the meeting on 18 February.</p> <p>BJ asked if the embryonic policies were consistent with the recently finalised Core Strategy (WCS). TR commented that this was a question a Link Officer should be able to answer quickly. DT said it would not harm if a Cricklade NP policy reinforced the WCS it simply must not contradict it.</p>	MC

<p>LC said there were three separate work areas that needed to be progressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. where follow on research was required to understand more e.g. to check policy background or validity ii. whether some policies were missing i.e. where issues had been raised in Cricklade consultations that had not been picked up in the other NPs which had been reviewed iii. to check compliance with WCS 	
<p>MC noted PB had emailed observations to him that day following the workshop (which PB had not attended) and these needed to be considered.</p>	
<p>TR noted he had circulated some draft policies which addressed (ii) as he had been actioned and he would welcome feedback on these. LC felt they needed to be reviewed.</p>	
<p>It was noted that the existence of the final WCS was helpful in respect of (iii). Although a large document the parts of the WCS that would apply to Cricklade were smaller as much was for other Community Areas. It was noted the structure of the document remained unchanged from earlier drafts.</p>	
<p>TR asked if Henning as WC Link Officer could be asked to review the policies as drafted, for suitability and compliance with the WCS. This could be done from his home or office without the need to travel and would be a means for WC to supply the support which they were being funded to provide. LC asked what was the role of the Link Officer and whether this was appropriate and noted that items in (i) above were still needing to be done in follow up work by members of the NPWP (e.g. understanding Secured By Design).</p>	
<p>After discussion TR's suggestion was supported and MC was tasked to ask Henning to review potential policies for compliance with the WCS (see later discussion).</p>	
<p>With the Core Strategy finalised the indicative numbers of new houses in the RWBCCA excluding RWB town could be considered firm and it was therefore appropriate for Cricklade to discuss with NEW-V how these should be split across the two NPs. MC would write to Ray Thomas and Chair of the NEW-V NP to make a formal request for their latest thinking on the numbers of new homes they were considering as it was essential the two NPs worked together on this issue. It was noted that developer activity such as the result of the Beechcroft appeal may have a major impact. Information given by WC at the Beechcroft appeal, such as the number of new houses in Lyneham, may also change the target numbers of homes for Cricklade. MC would also seek advice from WC including an update on where the settlement boundary review process had reached.</p>	MC
<p>MC confirmed that WC had received summary results from the questionnaire by the end of January as had been promised.</p>	MC
<p>LC requested that Henning should be asked what percentage of affordable housing COULD Cricklade do (draft policy H3), and also whether a policy could specify the mix between types of affordable housing/shared ownership (draft H4).</p>	MC
<p>Henning should also be asked whether the Core Strategy defined "strong local connection" in relation to prioritising sales of new homes. BJ noted the definition had become more stringent for Housing Association housing and possibly PB should be asked for his view. MC said PB had raised points related to this in his email.</p>	MC
<p>LC asked whether it was realistic to require Lifetime Homes Standards on a percentage of new build (draft H10). BJ said he understood all new build needed to meet this standard under existing building regulations therefore this was already covered.</p>	

Draft H15 required an understanding of what standards were applied to rural areas by the Institute of Lighting Engineers. BJ undertook to investigate what this meant	BJ
Draft H16 required an understanding of what “Secured by Design” meant. RS undertook to investigate.	RS
Draft H17 referenced whether the need for chimneys should be made a policy. It was noted that eco houses did not have chimneys but mock ones could be added for aesthetic reasons. MC undertook to investigate what other plans contained.	MC
Draft H20 specified a minimum garage size. MC undertook to investigate what this should be.. It was noted that many existing garages do not meet the size standard quoted.	MC
NPWP members agreed to a deadline of 4 March to bring updates on the above issues which would be discussed during the next normal meeting. The detail of TR’s proposed policies would be discussed at the same time, so that a consolidated set of policies could be sent to Henning for review by him once.	MC
5. Work with Alison Eardley Consulting (AEC)	
NPWP members had been sent copies of an email exchange with AEC.	
In summary advice was to progress to something firm which people could “push back on” rather than attempt to do more “gap filling” at this stage. It was considered that AEC had probably been influenced by comments from Henning and his manage at WC on the best way forward. It was considered the advice was now clear and in writing that it would be easier to get feedback to fill the gaps if target audiences were given draft policies on which to comment.	
DT suggested it would be helpful if AEC completed the task “to prepare a paper on vision, objectives and policy opportunities” for circulation prior to a meeting with her. This would be a useful view from an “outsider” based on work to date and the WCS. AEC would be asked to complete this by 18 February (or if not an alternative date to be agreed with AEC). It was noted AEC had requested specific information to enable her to do this task.	LC/MC
6. To agree the next steps regarding the TR draft HGV Report	
MC said he had received some feedback following the circulation of the report in October and his suggested way forward was he would meet with TR to agree a final draft before 18 February. The main issue was how the potential to close High St North to HGVs should be handled. There were other points of detail to be considered as possible amendments, to ensure it was factual and did not contain subjective opinion, prior to it being sent to Henning for final review. TR was congratulated on a thorough piece of work.	MC/TR
RS asked what the proposition was that the document was intending to address. It was noted that traffic and transport policies were to be considered at a later workshop and this was background to that.	
7. To consider whether the structure of the draft NP document needs amending	
JC said he would provide suitable maps at the end of the process when it was clear what information maps had to show. TR said he would need maps for his appendix.	JC to c/f
DT asked that anyone who was circulating even early stage drafts should share those with the NPWP members as a whole so that everyone could keep track of what everyone else was doing especially where there may be overlap.	ALL

It was agreed this applied to all emails on NP issues as it could then be left to recipients to decide what was relevant or not and that it would apply from now on.	ALL
LC asked that section drafts should be brought to the meeting for sign off before being included in the master draft Plan. This would be a standing item on future agendas	MC/ALL
It was agreed that one individual needed to manage a master document and related documentation. Although a new Town Clerk had been appointed the Council office was still short staffed and so it was unrealistic to expect this support from existing council staff. It was recognised the commitment could be quite onerous as an Inspector may want to see an audit trail through to supporting documents. The previous Town Clerk had been keeping a communication file and this was good and needed to be continued.	MC
It was agreed the post was sufficiently important that paid support should be sought, as no-one amongst existing NPWP members could volunteer to do it. It was helpful for an individual to start as soon as possible. <i>[DT/BJ left the meeting].</i>	
It was agreed it was an administrative role that did not require planning experience and it would be preferable to have someone local rather than someone who worked remotely.	
It was agreed that MC would speak to Tina Jones the new Town Clerk to confirm whether the existing office staff could undertake the role, and if he would take suggestions from Tina and other NPWP members on suitable candidates he could investigate who may provide this paid support.	MC
RS suggested that it was time to put together a skeleton draft document that could contain all the pieces done to date. This was agreed. RS would put the first draft together. All work done to date should be sent to RS for inclusion.	RS ALL
<p>8. To agree the next steps regarding the second public consultation report</p> <p>It was agreed that for question 3a only the most popular five or so developments listed should be published in the main body of the report (with associated comments), as those with a single response were not material enough to be relevant. As with the previous consultation report, a full list of all responses would be available as an Appendix.</p>	
MC would circulate a draft.	MC
TR requested that the full exact wording of each sub bullet in Q1 and Q2 should be included in the final draft.	
<p>9a. Campus Activity</p> <p>RS reported that a planning application for the Stones Lane site had not been submitted yet. She did not know the cause of the delay.</p>	
<p>9b. Extra Care/Nursing Home</p> <p>RS reported there was a meeting of the group planned earlier that day and an event was now being planned for 15 May in the Town Hall. This would assemble agencies who could publicise what was available in terms of health care and support. The event would also seek to gather information on what services were needed. Everyone in Cricklade would be invited. It was highlighted that provision of a nursing home was not part of what was being considered by the group. JC promised to provide RS a contact from HealthWatch Wiltshire who may want to be included</p>	JC
<p>9c. Culverhay Steering Group</p> <p>MC reported in the absence of PB. Amended plans were expect to be put out to public consultation in March. The process of investigation with Thames Water was ongoing.</p>	

<p>It was noted there had been criticism on Facebook that a property was being left empty despite families wanting social housing in Cricklade. Although this was not down to the NP process, NPWP members were aware some people may not realise this.</p> <p>9d. Developer Activity There was still no update on when the decision regarding the Beechcroft Appeal for land south of Giles Avenue would be published, and no known activity from any other developer.</p> <p>10. Budget Update A claim for DCLG grant of £5100.89 had been submitted based on NP expenditure. This was the end of the grant availability.</p> <p>11. Items for recommendation to Planning Committee None.</p> <p>12. Any Other Business JC asked that the NPWP should consider a policy for change of use of land from agricultural to equestrian use. It was becoming a regular feature at CTC PCT meetings and was the “thin end of the wedge” that allowed development in the open countryside. TR recollected there had been a comment raised during the first consultation on this point. JC was tasked to prepare a draft policy for consideration, possibly referencing a similar policy in the existing Cotswold District Council Plan.</p> <p>LC raised the issue of the lack of resources available within the NPWP. It was noted that Sue Holbrook had stepped down for personal reasons. MC suggested there should be a renewed appeal in the Chronicle and Ripples, and other NPWP members were asked to approach people they knew who may be willing to be part of the NPWP. It was felt there was now more clarity on tasks that could better define what was expected from people.</p> <p>TR asked that the Chronicle should contain the dates of all meetings – this had not been the case recently. It was noted that no members of the public had taken the opportunity to be present at NPWP meetings that had been advertised.</p> <p>JC suggested he would approach the Flood Wardens to see if any would be interested.</p> <p>13. Dates of Working Party Meetings at 6pm 18th February, 4th March, 18th March, 1st April, 15th April</p> <p>There was discussion around dates beyond April. LC said she would be unavailable the last week of each month, and there were problems with other dates suggested. MC undertook to investigate further and circulate suggested future dates.</p> <p>The meeting closed at 7.52pm</p>	<p>JC</p> <p>MC ALL</p> <p>JC</p> <p>MC</p>
---	---