

## Neighbourhood Plan Working Group Thursday 12<sup>th</sup> January 2017 at 2pm

### Cricklade Town Council Chambers

#### Notes

Cllr Mark Clarke <i>Chairman</i> (MC)	Cllr John Coole (JC)	Duncan May <i>CTC Deputy Town Clerk</i> (DTC)	Cllr Bob Jones (BJ)
Neil Dixon (ND)	Tim Russell (TR)	Cllr Ruth Szybiak (RS)	

Also in attendance

Liz Beth (Liz Beth Planning LB)

#### 1) Apologies for absence.

Lesley Cowley & Cllr Hodgson

#### 2) To Note the resignation from the Working Group of Phil Bowley

The NPWG NOTED the resignation letter from PB to the WG. MC explained the reasons for this as there was a conflict of interest with Greensquare recent acquisition of Land at The Forty and their plans to develop the site.

MC has written a letter to PB accepting his resignation and thanking him for his hard work and contributions over the years.

#### 3) To consider and approve the notes from the last meeting

The Neighbourhood Plan Notes from 13<sup>th</sup> December 2016 were approved by the WG.

#### 4) To Consider the Action Points from the above meeting where not a separate item on the agenda.

The WG expressed concerns that WC had not put in a consultation response as yet. Members asked could a lack of response from WC create problems later on.

LB- WC could put some comments in the Reg 16 consultation. Even if WC put comments in late it is in the NPWG's interest to look at them and include if possible. The NPWG AGREED to give WC till Friday then issue them with an reminder suggesting that their actions are not helpful. LB would like the final responses by the end of January.

The plan is CTC's plan and CTC is in the driving seat . **Action MC**

#### 5) To review the Reg 14 consultation

The WG NOTED that a No Comment on a response = support for the policies.

Members discussed the way the policies are grouped it was AGREED that responders could be grouped by policy. If responders just support and make no comment just add the numbers up. If the responder makes a comment attach their name only.

At the end of the section put in a summary of comments. This summary is the WG's summary to evidence our policies not a mouthpiece for developers views, the NPWG has nothing to gain by giving the examiner the developers arguments.

The Reg 16 to WC is open to consultation by CTC as well, after the 6 weeks the Draft Plan becomes WC's document.

The examiner will only consider what comments do not meet the conditions.

The NPWG AGREED to put the consultation statement in and produce the NPWG's form with a list of policies and the number who support each policy.

Only name the responder if the responder has made a comment.

The Highways comment raised should be raised to the appropriate Highways authority.

## **6) To consider the Reg 14 Responses;**

The WG went through the responses received

Response 1 & 2) no comment, approve

Response 3) add comment

Response 4) add comment

Response 5&6) no comment, approve

Response 7) add comment

Response 8) Include this point about parking and spaces for dwellings.

Response 9) Highways England , this is quite a full answer from Highways England, due to A419

Response 10) Send map to ND **Action DTC**

Response 13) The map used in the Draft Plan is not suitable. This map is out of date as sites outside it have been built . Sites that are under appeal do not need to be included. The WG AGREED that the plan needs a more up to date settlement boundary.

Changes to include; the boundary should be around the Purton Rd development (Greensquare Homes.) the two areas in gray in the map in the draft plan. Also the Phase 1 Stones Farm boundary needs updating slightly.

The settlement boundary map should have the wording to explain the map on the lines of: '*we have taken our plan out of N. Wilts plan but have .... Includes and excludes .....*' This wording should be at least a paragraph in length.

The Settlement Boundary should include sites within it where planning permission is granted, but not include sites where only planning permission has been applied for.

The NP policies become weaker without any changes to the settlement boundary.

The Policies have to be consistent with the map.

Response 14) DPDS comments summarised and OK

Response 17) See response 13 , Boundary change should be slightly down played by using the words 'clearer' and 'clarifying' to explain change.

Response 18) The NPWG discussed policy H7 Housing for the Elderly, issue brought up by this response . H7 needs to add a number eg 1 dwelling in 10 'as part of the development' as this policy is not clear.

H7 should add a percentage of the disabled as well. So maybe add elderly and disabled properties. Cricklade has roughly 10% of households have one person with a disability (453). Amend the table and change the title with a paragraph to explain the change.

The plan will be monitored on a regular basis not, so the NPWG can keep on top of the necessary changes to legislation and Government policy.

Response 19) Objections to the railway are noted. The plan does not actually say how near Pauls Croft it will pass.

Response 20) This is from the Environment Agency and flood risk comment is a valid one, that developments should not increase flood risk to the site itself. WC have a policy on flooding.

Responses 21-26) Noted , if no comment (agree)

Response 27) We have policies on the infrastructure – transport, sewage + drainage, health and education facilities.

Response 28) No level crossing in Cricklade.

Response 29) H3 Responder would prefer numbers, the plan could have an example in the text. Bungalows- this has been addressed in H7.

Policy B6- the responder makes a good comment here about, they are talking about an area near Chelworth when saying' businesses welcome, but they should be subject to no visual intrusion and single storey with screening.

LAF3 - 'Policy should rule dual use of ground that is used for surface water management'. This is surface water management eg ponds at Stones Farm, open drainage is not Open Space. Add sentence' *Sustained drainage systems (SuDS) will not normally be appropriate for public open space*'.

LAF4 – This point about sites inside and outside the settlement boundary has been clarified in H1.

LAF 8 – This paragraph says what it needs to say. As this is a legal point so is obtuse. the WG AGREED to take out 'where possible in the paragraph.

Members AGREED actions still to do:

- Helpful to have LB to another meeting.
- Consultation Statement to draft
- Conditions Statement Action LB
- Put 'table' in the Consultation Document
- Adapt Plan with 10% evidence
- Settlement Boundary
- Give WC a firm nudge for a response.

LB – emphasized that the NPWG really needs to see what WC has written. As she cannot do the Final Conditions Statement till she has a final idea of the plan. She needs this by Mid February at the latest. The Final Plan has to go to FTC for approval at their meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> March 2017

**7) To consider the preliminary work on the Statement of Community Involvement.**

MC- has started work on the Statement of Community Involvement, ongoing . **Action MC/DTC**

**8) Project Plan Update**

This was previously done by LB Planning but has not been updated for a while. This does need updating  
**Action LB/DTC**

**9) Update on DCLG Grant Application**

The NPWG has been awarded £2756.00 by Groundwork and has been sent by BACS.

**10) To Receive an Update on:**

a) **Extra care facility/nursing home** – None.

b) **Culverhay Steering Group** – Hopefully the planning permission will be approved soon and should be signed off in the near future.

**c) Developer Activity –**

**Greensquare Housing Association** – Will be coming to PCT Committee meeting on 16<sup>th</sup> January 2017.

**Stones Farm DPDS Consultants** – Coming to an Extra-ordinary PCT meeting on 25<sup>th</sup> January 2017.

This application is outside the Settlement Boundary.

**Bloor Homes** – None

**Hannick Homes** – None ,

The WG had a discussion on whether the planning applications outside the Settlement Boundary should be objected to as a rule. And, whether the NP would lose its credibility if applications were voted in favour by the PCT Committee if outside the Settlement Boundary.

**d) Dialogue with the NEW-V-NP and any other NP Groups-** None

**12) Any Recommendations to the Planning Committee -**

None

**13) Any Other Business and Items for a Future Agenda**

Responses with WC's view hopefully.

**14) Agree Dates and Times of Future Working Group Meetings.**

Thursday 26<sup>th</sup> January 2017 at 2pm in Chambers.

Meeting ended 17.25 pm

Duncan May

26<sup>th</sup> January 2017