

## Cricklade Neighbourhood Plan Working Party Meeting

### NOTES FROM THE MEETING

**Wednesday 18<sup>th</sup> February 2015 at 7pm in the Town Council Chamber**

**NPWP Members Present:** Councillors: Mark Clarke (MC)

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

#### **1. Apologies for absence:**

Received from John Coole, Bob Jones, Ruth Szybiak, Chris Ball, Tina Jones.

The meeting noted the resignation of Chris Ball from the Working Party due to pressure of work requiring much overseas travel.

#### **2. To approve the notes from the meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> February 2015**

Approved without amendment.

#### **3. To consider the Action points from the 4<sup>th</sup> February meeting**

Circulation of the letter from a resident remained outstanding, It required scanning before it could be emailed (see section 4 below).

MC

The draft preamble to the Plan remained outstanding.

MC

A letter to Ray Thomas Chair of the NEW-V NP to request an update on progress and specifically numbers of news houses being planned remained outstanding.

MC

A check on the percentage of affordable housing required remained outstanding.

MC

Confirmation of any standard definition of "strong local connection" remained outstanding.

MC

The following actions were carried forward to 4th March meeting:

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.

Following their meeting MC would circulate a revised draft of the HGV report prepared by TR which would incorporate agreed amendments. It was agreed that the report would be discussed and finalised at the 4 March NPWP in order that the 18 March workshop meeting on policies could use it as an agreed base.

MC/TR

Action on maps provision carried forward. MC would ask Alison Fisher to provide the maps so that they would be in a consistent style.

MC

As a means of ensuring efficient and timely circulation of NP related emails it was agreed an NP email address should be set up which automatically forwarded emails sent to it to all NPWP members. Where a member wanted action this should be clearly stated, otherwise a simple “fyi” would indicate information only.

MC would request permission from Tina Jones as Town Clerk for DT to set this up. MC/DT

There were no section drafts completed since the last meeting to be sent for review.

The action on RS to provide a skeleton document was deferred pending appointment of an administrator who could better pick up the task. MC/  
Admin

MC had established that none of the permanent staff in the CTC office were able to provide the administrative support needed by the process but he received an approach of an offer to provide this paid support. During discussion it was thought that the individual needed by the NPWP would need good IT and document management (version control) skills rather than Town Council/general planning experience. It was agreed that LC and DT would develop a bullet point list of requirements that would provide the skeleton of a job specification and this would be circulated to NPWP members for their comment prior to the post being publicised as a vacancy. LC/DT

It was felt the post could be considered a contracted third party service and need not be undertaken by an employee of the Council. MC would check CTC minutes to see if the NPWP had permission to appoint contractors without referring back to CTC. MC

LC expressed concern that the Communication File may not have been kept fully up to date during the transfer of Town Clerk responsibilities. MC undertook to check it had been maintained. MC

The following actions were carried forward pending confirmation of completion:  
JC promised to provide RS a contact from HealthWatch Wiltshire who may want to be included. JC

JC was tasked to prepare a draft policy for equestrian land use for consideration, possibly referencing a similar policy in the existing Cotswold District Council Plan. JC

JC suggested he would approach the Flood Wardens to see if any would be interested in joining the NPWP. JC

#### **4. To consider the first draft of the Second Public Consultation (Housing) Report**

MC had circulated a draft and requested comments emailed to him either at the meeting or within 48 hours (particularly noting those NPWP members not present at the meeting). ALL

TR suggested inclusion the map that showed geographic spread of responses: this was agreed. MC

LC suggested the document would benefit from an Executive Summary stating “this is what you told us” on one page as this would help the audit trail towards policies. MC agreed he would write and include this. MC

MC noted the document simply summarised facts without giving a commentary or more subjective interpretation. It was agreed this was generally appropriate and a similar approach to the report on the first consultation. The one page summary could be used to pick up the common themes arising from individual responses.

MC noted the letter from a resident earlier mentioned was from Clive Wilce and contained mainly comments on Stockham Close which had been approved as a development whilst Clive was Chairman of CTC. These were included in the consultation report.

MC said he would also add the names of the current members of the NPWP.

MC

#### **5. Working with Alison Eardley Consulting (AEC)**

AEC had yet to see the records of/notes from the Focus Groups and also wished to see the second consultation report when completed. MC to send both to AEC.

MC

AEC had been offered alternative dates of 18 March and 1 April to lead a workshop with members of the NPWP. This would identify where gaps in the WCS policies existed or where more local detail was appropriate to flesh out WCS policies based on the key issues that affected Cricklade which had been identified responses. It had been decided this would be helpful before attempting to fill gaps in community engagement, because then something tangible could be provided against which people could push back.

As most NPWP members were not available on 18 March it was agreed the meeting on this date would need to be rescheduled.

It was agreed the meeting with AEC should take place during the normal working day and a start time of 11am was proposed with an indicative end time of 2pm.

LC

The action on AEC "to prepare a paper on vision, objectives and policy opportunities" for circulation prior to a meeting with her remained outstanding and LC would ask AEC to send so that NPWP members had time to consider it before the 1 April meeting with her.

LC

#### **6. To consider the invitation to Wiltshire Council Workshop**

CTC had an invitation to send one representative to a workshop concerned with the ongoing activity of the settlement boundaries review. It was noted the date of 23 February was very short notice and clashed with a Full CTC meeting which made it difficult for a Town Councillor to attend; however it was agreed that it was important for someone from the NPWP to attend. TR agreed to represent the NPWP/CTC.

TR

#### **7. To consider an email from WC regarding the SA/SEA procedures**

The email was noted and NPWP members considered it did not add anything to what was already known. When the contents of the Draft NP were clearer it would be necessary to ask WC to state whether an SA/SEA would be required. TR quoted the wording of the actual regulations which he thought indicated Cricklade would not need a SA/SEA.

#### **8. Updates**

##### **a. Campus Activity**

There was no update in the absence of RS.

##### **b. Extra Care Facility/Nursing Home**

A draft of a survey due to be carried out in April/May by the Extra Care Working Group had been sent to the NPWP as a matter of courtesy to ask whether any further questions or amendments for questions would be helpful. The survey was aimed at the over 50 age group. It was expected results would be made publicly available.

LC suggested that there needed to be clarity in questions e.g. to separate where "bungalows" were allied with "extra care" – these needed to be clearly separated so that it was clear which one or whether both were being supported by a respondent. MC would feed back this comment (Q10c).

MC

### **c. Culverhay Steering Group**

PB had little to report. Greensquare were still waiting on a response from Thames Water (which could take 26 weeks). He expected a planning application would be deferred after the general election as the current plans would probably need to be adjusted following Thames Water's feedback.

The latest plan (with the latest number of additional homes predicted) should be available for the next NPWP meeting after it had been shared with the Culverhay Steering Group.

TR asked if it were possible to share the cost of seeking Thames Water's advice, as it was possible a policy could require developers to undertake this work prior to applying to planning. PB said he would find out how Thames Water calculated this fee.

PB

### **d. Developer Activity**

A planning application for outline permission for ~25 dwellings on the Stones Farm site had been submitted to WC. NPWP members considered it was in principle not appropriate for the NPWP to comment as a formal body, however it was important that the outcome of the Second Public Consultation was placed in the public domain as soon as possible so that CTC PCT and other members of the public who wished to comment could reference this should they wish and so it was agreed this would be placed on the NP website during the first week of March. CTC PCT could should it wish use information prepared by NPWP and placed in the public domain to help frame the CTC response to such applications.

It was noted that an application for industrial units at Chelworth Lodge had been refused at the North Wilts Area Planning Committee. (This has been opposed by CTC PCT and the officer had recommended refusal.) It was specifically noted that refusal was based partly on CP19 and HGV traffic.

### **9. Items for Recommendation to Planning Committee**

None (unless approval is needed for NPWP to appoint contractors).

### **10. Any Other Business**

None.

### **11. Workshop Session "Developing Our Vision for Cricklade"**

LC led a discussion on what Cricklade's vision should be based on existing NPs from other areas, comments received from the Cricklade community and generic advice from planning websites.

### **12. Dates of Working Party Meetings**

Wednesday 4 <sup>th</sup> March	7pm
Monday 16 <sup>th</sup> March	7pm (Workshop on Traffic Policies)
Wednesday 1 <sup>st</sup> April	11am-3pm (Workshop with Alison Eardley)
Wednesday 15 <sup>th</sup> April	7pm
Wednesday 6 <sup>th</sup> May	7pm
Wednesday 27 <sup>th</sup> May	7pm