

## Neighbourhood Plan Working Party

Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> October 2017 at 2:00 PM

Cricklade Town Council Chambers

Cllr Mark Clarke Chairman (MC)	Cllr Bob Jones (BJ)	Cllr Chris Hodgson (CH)	Lesley Cowley (LC)
Duncan May (DTC) Deputy Town Clerk	Cllr Tony Clements (AC)	Tim Russell (TR)	
Ruth Szybiak (RS)	Cllr John Coole (JC)	Neil Dixon (ND)	

### Notes

	Action
<p><b>1. Apologies for absence</b> All present</p> <p><b>2. To consider and approve the notes from the meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2017</b> Members AGREED a minor change to point 8 . Notes then approved.</p> <p><b>3. Cricklade Neighbourhood Plan update :</b> <b>To consider a response to the preliminary request for clarification by the Independent Examiner</b> Members NOTED that Andrew Ashcroft has been appointed as the independent examiner for the Cricklade NP and he has visited Cricklade prior to his examination of the Draft Plan. The WG's satisfaction with this appointment was noted as this is the examiner the WG recommended. The examiner has asked the WG to respond to some questions he has forwarded to the WG via the link officer which will clarify some areas. The WG AGREED to concentrate on the examiners questions so a response could be sent from the WG by the examiners preferred date of Thursday 26<sup>th</sup> October 2017.</p> <p><b>Examiners comments</b> <b>Policy H1 - Does Figure 5 provide sufficient clarity for the implementation of the Plan through the development management process?</b> Members AGREED the map could be improved but the Plan used the best available map at the time. A map with better definition will be sourced.</p>	<p>Action MC</p>

**Policy H6 –(Local Connection and Strong Communities) I can see the supporting text at 4.1.12 Is there any supporting evidence for this policy ?**

Supporting evidence from consultation feedback which suggest there is a need for housing for young families and older residents downsizing. There is a consensus that existing resident's requirements should be met before people from outside Cricklade. Local connection keeps assists with community cohesion.

**Why has a threshold of five dwellings been applied?**

This policy tries to assist smaller housing developments often referred to as 'Windfall Sites'

**To what extent does the Town Council consider the policy has regard to national policy?**

Section 14 of the NPPF which states: ' local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area'. Members requested this to be shown to LB Planning for advice.

**Policy H7 (Housing for the Elderly and Disabled) – Is there enough evidence to support the threshold figures in the third paragraph of the policy?**

The main supporting evidence is provided by the 2011 Office of National Statistics census data, which shows a substantial percentage of Cricklade residents are over 60 yrs of age, over the Wiltshire average.

Also not to burden developers who wish to build 1 or 2 dwellings with a requirement to provide for a particular section of the community.

**Policy H8 – How does the Town Council consider that the policy is in general conformity with policies 44 and 46 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy?**

Core Policy 44 relates to affordable on rural housing sites on service centres sites which Cricklade is. This is only partially applicable to Cricklade as though the Draft Plan mentions a nursing home the site will not be large and is likely to only have a small quantity of affordable houses. There are no suitable sites within the settlement boundary.

Core Policy 46 relates to meeting the needs of vulnerable and older people, the location of which should be close to good local services. Cricklade meets the criteria as is a local service centre.

**Policies H10/11 (Foul Water Management & Flooding Risk and Surface Water Management) – These policies read more as a planning application validation requirements rather than policies. Are they appropriate for a neighbourhood plan?**

The WG thinks these are relevant and appropriate as consultations have highlighted flooding as a major concern for residents. Recent planning applications have been proposed for areas of Cricklade that have a previous history of flooding. Often in areas where surveys have shown foul water management to be approaching capacity.

**Policy TT2 – (Traffic Calming) I have read this policy. I intend to recommend that it is moved to a separate part of the Plan. Does the Town Council have any comments on this matter?**

The WG thought this policy is appropriate to the Draft Plan and is a land use issue as traffic has an effect on land use.

Members asked:

- Where in the plan did the examiner think of moving this policy?
- Perhaps the wording could be changed and the policy amended.
- Ask LB Planning's views on this matter.

**Policy B4 – what is meant by a 'significant' part of the development should be commercial in nature? As drafted does the policy have the clarity required by the NPPF?**

The WG AGREED the word 'significant' could be deleted so the sentence would read ' The ground floor should be commercial in nature with a ground floor retail frontage in keeping with the requirement of policy'. Policy B4 is devised to keep the existing retail frontage in the Town and if possible increase the retail area.

**Could the site be displayed on a separate plan or on Figure 13 (as a separate policy)**

The WG AGREED the location would be best shown on the Fig 13 map

**Policy LAF4 – (Local Green Space) What is the logic for a overlap between the proposed local green spaces and the wider range of open spaces in Policy LAF 1?**

Members AGREED to drop LAF 4 from the NP as this was put in the Draft Plan before CTC acquired the Hallsfield Meadow site. So this policy needs updating.

**Will there be an inherent conflict between policies LAF1 and LAF4 with regard to the 5 local green spaces?**

There is an overlap between the policies. Some sites are required to be in both policies due to the levels of protection the policies recommend.

**I can see that the Open Space audit provides comprehensive information. However please can I be advised of the size of LAF4 Site A Hallsfield Meadow?**

The size of Hallsfield meadow is 5.28 Hectares.



<p><b>Stones Farm (Phase 1 farmyard and 2 Greenfield) –</b> None</p> <p><b>Hannick Homes (Forty and Fiddle) –</b> None</p> <p><b>Bloor Homes (Horsey Down) –</b> Bloor Homes have made a presentation to PCT committee 12<sup>th</sup> September 2017 on their plans for development. Advised plans to be submitted to WC. CTC has heard nothing as yet regarding this application..</p> <p><b>d. Dialogue with any neighbouring NP groups</b> Highworth NP has been overruled so that additional housing can be developed to meet Swindon’s five year housing supply requirements.</p> <p><b>7. Any Other Business including items for recommendation to CTC Planning Committee</b> PCT to CONSIDER Thames Water Sewerage letter.</p> <p><b>8. Agree dates and times of future Working Group Meetings</b> TR- No need to schedule a meeting yet ND cannot make 5<sup>th</sup> Nov -2<sup>nd</sup> Dec 2017</p> <p>Meeting finished 15.40pm Duncan May November 2017</p>	<p><b>Action JC &amp; DTC</b></p>
--	-----------------------------------