

	<p>neighbourhood planning in Wiltshire. The purpose of the meeting was to form a collective response. He would keep the SG posted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good Energy has pulled out of the Sadler’s Mead development and there is now uncertainty about the future of this development. • The Government will shortly be publishing further proposals to shake up the planning system. Separately, home owners will soon be able to add an extra two floors to their houses without needing full planning permission and developers will be able to knock down unused commercial premises and build residential units in place. These changes will be allowed under Permitted Development. This restricts the powers of local councils to prevent development going ahead. This will be monitored closely as it will have an impact on NPs. More information to follow once the proposals have been released.
15.	<p><u>TOPIC GROUP ISSUES</u></p> <p>Town Centre (JK)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final TG meeting had been held. • Bridge Centre/Bath Road proforma completed. • Shop Front Design Guide progressing. • Updating of the Conservation Area Appraisal done in 2006/7 proving to be a very large task - meeting with AC on 10 August to run through. Photos and introduction needed. • Public Realm Improvements and River Green not finished yet. <p>Housing (RH)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zoom meetings held. • Design Code for major developments - Andrea Pellegram (AP) has rewritten it and highlighted areas we cannot influence. AC added that version 1 of the document was on this agenda but that he had seen a version 4, and that it would make sense for the document to come back to the SG for review once the Topic Group (TG) were happy with it. No SG Members had any comments to make on the document at this stage. <p>Green Infrastructure (CC)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zoom meeting held and reviewed policy topic areas. • Will meet up with the Town Centre TG to work on green corridor. • Social Justice in Green Infrastructure - across other policies. <p>Community Infrastructure (AC on behalf of AP)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting held recently. • More arts/culture text needs to be included within policy so this was being redrafted by AP <p>Transport (JS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to Public Transport proforma on this Agenda. • Electric Vehicle Charging and Cycling proformas already agreed and on Google Drive. • Awaiting more information from Sue McGill on walking routes. <p>Economy (AC)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final TG meeting 2 weeks ago. • TG still want policy on incubator units. AC will work with Alice Porter on this - another survey to be done which perhaps could be sent to school leavers. • Circular Economy proforma and Sustainable Construction proforma on this Agenda.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TG unable to come up with standalone policy around Sustainable Transport To/From Commercial Premises, but work already done by Mel Moden in her proforma could be used by Transport TG. <p>Sustainability (NM)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitted Renewable Energy draft policy on this Agenda. • Will respond to feedback and hone policies on Carbon Neutral Development proforma.
16.	<p><u>POLICY PLANNER</u></p> <p>AC explained that this is a working document, to be updated. It is stored in the general folder of Google Drive. At this meeting and at meetings in September and possibly October, policies would be agreed in principle. NM added that this was a useful overview which could be used to cross reference.</p>
17.	<p><u>DRAFT POLICIES REVIEW</u></p> <p>AC presented draft policies for approval and SG Members agreed the following policies in principle, except for the Chippenham Design Code:</p> <p>7.1 Housing Design - Noted</p> <p>7.1.1 Chippenham Design Code - now on version 4 and Housing TG still working on it. It was suggested that this is not agreed at the present time and is brought back to the SG in September/October. AC said that this version was probably too long and suggested it could refer to other policies in the NP to avoid duplication. He praised AP for her work on this. DW added that wording should not be subjective. When a developer reads this document, they should be clear on what we want them to do. It was agreed there was no need for an executive summary for this policy but that it would be a good idea to have one for the whole NP. CC queried where the reference of ‘development of over 50 dwellings’ had come from. AC said that more clarity/evidence on thresholds was needed on this. If developers are to apply these principles, the TG needs to work out when these threshold triggers apply.</p> <p>ACTION: Housing TG/AP to continue to work on Design Code and amend in light of above comments</p> <p>7.1.2 Housing Design Evidence Paper - a summary of workshops held</p> <p>7.2 Electric Vehicle Charging - NM mentioned that there are different types of charging methods e.g. taxi ranks need rapid charging so the policy could be more explicit. DW stressed this would be difficult as technology will change over the life of the document. A fixed charging point may not be suitable but in-surface charging may be possible in the future. More research needed on taxi policy. NM queried the figure of charging points for 1 in every 4 parking spaces as being out of date and liable to change over time. DW said this was better than specified by the Government and in a few other places. It is important to ensure every space can be upgraded in future. NM queried if ducting included cabling and DW said it should. JS said that there needs to be charging points for buses. Most charge overnight at the depot but could require more during the day. Local bus companies may invest in electric buses in the next 10 years. AC agreed this could be added to the Bus Infrastructure policy.</p> <p>ACTION: DW to review policy to see if can make more technical/explicit and amend in line with the above comments</p>

7.3 Carbon Neutral Development - NM described the policy, and explained that the off-setting was the most difficult section to achieve. He wanted to run the policy past contacts at the UK Green Building Council (UKGBC).

JS suggested that our carbon neutral targets need to align with WC's.

AC said this was a good draft policy and AP and himself had made some comments on the proforma. He thought the policy could be honed to be clearer on how compliance with the policy could be demonstrated. It was agreed that the policy should be less technical and slimmed down if possible. DW asked if there was anything that could be done to ensure solar panels are used on all new homes and the resulting energy used locally and not returned to the electric companies. NM referenced the recent Langley Park planning application where the developer had used less panels but stressed they were better quality. He suggested a reference to 'maximum roof space'. He agreed that it could be suggested that excess energy should be used locally.

ACTION: NM to review AC/AP comments and amend in line with the comments. NM to try to seek expert review from UKGBC

7.4 Sustainable Construction for Commercial Development - AC said this overlaps with Carbon Neutral Development policy and queried whether it was needed. It could be incorporated in Carbon Neutral Development policy and the Design Code. NM replied that it was useful and should be kept separate because it focused on the construction stage which the Carbon Neutral Development policy didn't. It should tie in with other policies though. With regard to the statement to demonstrate BREAAAM Excellence rating, AC queried if the NP was asking developers to submit too many documents up front with their applications rather than focusing in on one or two key documents for submission at planning application stage. NM replied that we should not be worried about asking for these standards. In principle this was good as a secondary policy. He would look at this again before the next meeting to rationalise it and if necessary NM, AC and Matthew Short could meet to discuss further.

DW queried if the NP should be making sure that the siting of new commercial premises can be accessed by public transport and not private vehicles. JS agreed but said that developments in the Town were sited a long way from bus routes and this would be hard to achieve. DW replied that he would just like the need recognised. CC suggested adding the justification why services are needed to the text.

ACTION: NM to review policy further (in consultation with AC and Matthew Short if required)

7.5 Access to Public Transport - JS said the first of the two policies ensures that new developments are designed to be accessed by public transport. With regard to large developments, planning applications are often submitted in a piecemeal form so a masterplan is needed for the full development in relation to public transport. Lots of best practice guidance is referred to in the proforma.

AC said that AP recommended specifically referring to best practice guidance on walking distances to bus stops in the first policy. JS replied that consideration should be given to care homes, etc. which would differ. It was important not just to refer to 'stops' which are not always necessary. Routing is more important. AC said this could also be mentioned in the Design Code. NM asked how we could influence the routing of buses and JS replied that WC was the main driver/co-ordinator. We need to justify what we want to see. AC added that we can't insist on specific routes. JS added that limiting car parking spaces on developments may

be too restrictive and cause problems elsewhere. The developer should have to identify routes and stops in the masterplan (transport assessment). Stops should not be provided if there is no service.

JS advised that the second policy highlights the need for enhanced existing bus infrastructure. The Bus Station needs to stay where it is and the shelters improved. NM added that should another better bus station site become available, we should be prepared to be flexible. AC replied that the policy covers this eventuality, but that the site would need to also be within the Town Centre. AC suggested adding electric vehicle charging points at the Bus Station to the policy. AC said AP had suggested we could ask for commuted sums from all major development (say 1%) to pay for bus infrastructure improvements so this could be added to the policy. NM asked if air pollution was a concern so can this be linked to electric buses somehow. JS replied there is a problem with the manufacturing industry but that electric/hydrogen buses are the future. It was agreed to include air pollution, cleaner buses, etc. in the supporting text.

ACTION: JS/AC to review policies further and amend in light of the above comments

7.6 Circular Economy - AC explained this would help give weight in the planning process to support those smaller businesses who might be adopting circular economy practices. AC added that Matthew Short had included some good examples. NM suggested this policy be more specific but AC advised that it was deliberately non-specific in order to avoid the issue of being a 'waste policy' per se, as it is more of a supportive/encouraging business policy, highlighting the issue of circular economy than anything else.

7.7 Bridge Centre/Bath Road Car Park Masterplan- AC explained that the York Minster NP had been used as a good example in drafting this policy. JK said that the maps he had drawn up would need to be done again professionally and suggested another map showing the location of the site. AC reported that AP would like greater mention of arts/culture in the policy to take account of the views of the Community Infrastructure TG. AP had suggested dropping the name 'Bridge Centre' as the building no longer exists but it was agreed to keep this for now. AP had also mentioned creating a neighbourhood development order for the site. AC stressed that this would add more time and cost and would need to be a separate development order/project. JK agreed that just the existing NP project parameters should be adhered to. CC mentioned the downgrading of the existing road and the need for a traffic flow study or aspirational statement. AC said this was tied up with the outcome of the HIF bid. JK suggested aiming for the best on site with the proviso that it could be phased if needed.

ACTION: AC to add references to arts/culture in policy

7.8 Renewable Energy - AC reported that Gemma Grimes had done a good job on this proforma, but wondered whether the policy wording may be too similar to the existing WC CP42 and could be adapted to be more uniquely local. Could draw from the Centre for Sustainability Energy workshops regarding preference on types of renewable energy. NM said the workshop was a stage 1 event but more work was needed. NM pointed out "On favour" should be corrected to read "in favour" and AC pointed out "The Council" needs rephrasing.

JS mentioned the weir and use of water power which had been considered in the past. NM said a study had been done but it had proved not to be viable against other options. AC asked if other types of renewable energy should be included, such as wind turbines. NM was unsure about the detail but agreed that we should be positive about wind turbines and that there may be opportunities to the south.

	<p>CC agreed it was good to keep the idea of water power on the table until it becomes cost effective.</p> <p>ACTION: NM/AC to liaise further with Gemma Grimes and policy wording to be amended in line with the above comments</p>
18.	<p><u>ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review new Topic Group proformas/draft policies. <p>NM asked AC what proformas might be ready for the next meeting. AC suggested wildlife corridors, conservation area and non-designated assets, shop fronts design guide. AC suggested tree policy is proving harder but would liaise further with Laura Audisio Carr-Saunders and Jake Bailey. NM suggested bringing in a contact from the Woodland Trust - he could put AC in touch and would send him details. AC reported no recent progress on Walking Routes policy yet.</p> <p>ACTIONS: AC to liaise further with Laura Audisio Carr-Saunders and Jake Bailey on trees. NM to send AC Woodland Trust contact. JS to chase Sue McGill on Walking Routes</p>
19.	<p><u>DATE/TIME OF NEXT MEETING</u></p> <p>1 September 2020, 6pm, remote meeting.</p> <p>NM reminded everyone to let AC have any comments on the meeting. JS said that being in control of muting/unmuting oneself make the meeting quicker.</p>
	<p>The meeting finished at 7.45pm</p>