



Minutes of a meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group held at the Town Hall, High Street, Chippenham on Tuesday 1 December 2020 at 6pm

Steering Group Members Present:	
Cllr Clare Cape (CC)	Ross Henning (RH)
Cllr Mary Norton (MN)	Jack Konynenburg (JK)
Cllr John Scragg (JS - Chairman)	David Mott (DM)
Cllr Sandie Webb (SW)	Steve Perry (SP)
	Dunstan Westbury (DW)
	Fiona Williams (FW)
Officers Present:	
Andrea Pellegram, Neighbourhood Planning Consultant (AP)	
Matt Kirby, Director of Community Services (MK)	
Andy Conroy, Planning Officer (AC)	
Ann Chard, Administrative Services Officer - Planning (Note Taker)	

In the absence of the Chairman, the meeting was chaired by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor John Scragg

57.	<b><u>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</u></b> There were apologies for absence from Councillors Ruth Lloyd and Nick Murry.
58.	<b><u>DECLARATION OF INTEREST</u></b> No declaration of interest was received.
59.	<b><u>PROTOCOL FOR VIRTUAL MEETINGS OF THE NPSG</u></b> JS ran through the Protocol for this virtual meeting.
60.	<b><u>MINUTES</u></b> The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 3 November 2020 were approved as a correct record.
61.	<b><u>CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• JS welcomed the new Director of Community Services, Matt Kirby to his first NPSG meeting.</li></ul>

- Wiltshire Local Plan Review - JS reported that a Cabinet meeting had been held today to agree a report setting out arrangements for a public consultation on growth areas for the Plan in early 2021.

AC explained that Chippenham growth areas had now been published and these areas were to the south and east with up to 5,100 houses. Masterplans for these areas were more detailed than expected. The Cabinet report has only just been published and the SG will come back to it in Jan/Feb to form a strategy on how to deal with it and how it might affect the NP policies (and how we might affect WC policies). The Leader had mentioned that the HIF Bid documents should be published before Christmas with a separate public consultation in the New Year. When data comes in on Covid-19 trends, the NP will need to be updated to reflect changes.

SP raised concerns regarding being given only 48 hours to read such a large document before questions could be put to Cabinet. JS asked AC to include a link to the relevant section of the Cabinet report referring to Chippenham.

SG members who had attended the meeting gave feedback. Feedback from other parties included the need for the document to be much stronger with regard to the overall vision, closer ties with climate emergency and a vision for transport. SP stressed that traffic data should take into account changes to working lifestyles due to the pandemic and the climate emergency (meaning more people currently working from home and continuing to do so in future) and this may radically change the housing numbers and traffic assumptions for Chippenham and WC should review these. He added that WC had explained that the traffic data they were using for modelling was that used at the EIP into Chippenham Site Allocations DPD and so is old data. DW thought that WC had more recent traffic modelling data, as he had been collecting traffic data for Wiltshire Council 2 years ago. SP noted that freight traffic had also not been taken into account.

AP said it was important to think about how to respond to the upcoming public consultation as the NP should not address strategic issues, but CTC would want to respond regarding housing numbers and location of growth areas. She suggested AC write a letter to WC requesting the background evidence to help with policies. AC added that CTC will want to do a separate response and perhaps the NP could do a more focused response.

AP suggested a separate meeting to look at the WC Masterplan policies and check they match the policies in the NP Design Code. The Design Code has already been shared with WC and comments from WC are being looked at by AC. AP's view was that the Masterplan is a local policy and not a strategic policy and suggested stating that we claim the Masterplan for the NP. RH asked AC for a meeting to discuss revising the Design Guide.

- WALPA - AC reported that the meeting scheduled with WC for last Friday had been cancelled. The 5-year housing land supply figures were due to be released at this meeting but are delayed by 2 weeks as per the announcement at WC Cabinet.

**Actions:**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AC to write to WC requesting background evidence.</li> <li>• AC and RH to set up meeting re. Design Guide.</li> <li>• AC to circulate link to relevant sections of the WC Cabinet Report</li> </ul>
62.	<p><b><u>NEXT STEPS</u></b></p> <p>AC provided a verbal update following a meeting of CTC’s Corporate Management Team in respect of options to progress Plan through 2021 election period/purdah and Reg 14 Consultation. After the election, it is hoped that re-elected CTC Councillors will choose to remain on the SG but CTC Officers could not interfere in democratic process. It was suggested that AC explain to full Council in March via the usual NP Update Report that Reg 14 Consultation will take place in early May (shortly after the election). JS added that consultation should also take place on-line if things aren’t back to normal by then. SG meetings will still be held during purdah. AC will email Wiltshire Council Planners regarding whether the Town boundary can be amended prior to the election.</p> <p><b>Action:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AC to explain timeline for Reg 14 Consultation to full Council in March.</li> <li>• AC to email WC Planners re. boundary changes.</li> </ul>
63.	<p><b><u>POLICY PLANNER</u></b></p> <p>The updated Policy Planner was noted. AP had looked at Sue McGill’s information on walking routes in Google Drive and had written two policies, one on making transport infrastructure and car parks suitable for people with mobility issues and one on way marking for footpaths. AC, Nick Murry and Gemma Grimes had a meeting with Eden Renewables regarding a possible renewable energy (solar) farm site to the south of Pewsham Way. The River Green Corridor Masterplan will come back to the SG in January.</p>
64.	<p><b><u>DRAFT POLICIES REVIEW</u></b></p> <p>SG members agreed in principle the following draft policies, subject to any adjustments listed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8.1 Incubator Units</li> </ul> <p>There was some confusion regarding what ‘fully serviced’ meant for incubator units. AP suggested speaking to Huw Thomas regarding the criteria. It was suggested that as the government provides grants for these units, some information may be available on-line regarding size of units, what needs to be provided, etc. The importance of providing a range of sizes was stressed. AP suggested being specific on what is needed and providing evidence on why it is necessary.</p> <p>SG members reviewed the following items which were amended and brought back to SG members at their request:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8.2 - Chippenham Design Guide</li> </ul>

	<p>AC explained the revisions he had made to the document, including introducing thresholds. RH suggested that comments made by Louise Tilshed (WC Planner) regarding 'being in keeping with current buildings' needed to be more specific. The Facebook group Chippenham Then and Now could be a good source of photos which could demonstrate how design has changed over the years. JK added it was hard to describe quality design, but as an architect, he would look at the policy and make some suggestions.</p> <p>DM suggested the following amendments: Paras. 19-26 - reference to 'priority to foot/cycle over cars' does not mention public transport so needs to be amended to read 'active travel'. Para. 57a specifies the distance to reach a bus stop as 400m but this is different to the distance in the Pedestrian Access to Public Transport document. JS to check they match.</p> <p>AC noted discrepancy over thresholds for transferal of community halls to CTC.</p> <p>AP suggested that two meetings may be needed in January, the first for the draft Plan and the second to use to review proposals put forward by WC. AC added that this would depend on when the consultation starts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8.3 - Green Corridors Map</li> </ul> <p>It was agreed that it was important that roads do not to form barriers to wildlife. Developer contributions could perhaps be used to enhance some crossings.</p>
65.	<p><b><u>ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review comments on first draft version of Plan.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action:</b> First draft Plan to be sent to SG by about 18 December and SG to email any comments to AC before January meeting.</p>
66.	<p><b><u>DATE/TIME OF NEXT MEETING</u></b></p> <p>Tuesday 5 January 2021, remote meeting.</p>
	<p>The meeting finished at 7.20 pm</p>