



Minutes of a meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group held virtually on Zoom, on Tuesday 6 April 2021 at 6pm

Steering Group Members Present:	
Cllr Clare Cape (CC)	Ross Henning (RH)
Cllr Ruth Lloyd (RL)	Jack Konynenburg (JK)
Cllr Nick Murry (NM - Chairman)	David Mott (DM)
Cllr Mary Norton (MN)	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)	
Lynsey Nichols, Marketing & Communications Manager (LN)	
Ann Chard, Administrative Services Officer - Planning (Note Taker)	

101.	<b><u>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</u></b> There were apologies for absence from Councillors John Scragg and Sandie Webb.
102.	<b><u>DECLARATION OF INTEREST</u></b> Steve Perry declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 10 (minute 110) as the land referred to is to the rear of his property.
103.	<b><u>PROTOCOL FOR VIRTUAL MEETINGS OF THE NPSG</u></b> The Chairman referred to the Protocol for this virtual meeting.
104.	<b><u>MINUTES</u></b> The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 2 March 2021 were approved as a correct record.
105.	<b><u>CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>As part of the Pre-Regulation 14 stakeholder consultation process NM and AC had met with representatives from Langley Burrell Parish Council (LBPC) to update them on Chippenham Neighbourhood Plan (NP) draft policies and receive an update on progression of their revised NP. LBPC were supportive of the NP's green buffer and green corridor policies. A meeting had also taken</li></ul>

	<p>place today with representatives from Chippenham Without Parish Council (CWPC). CWPC were particularly interested in green corridor enhancement links and footpath links over the A350 to allow access into their Parish, whilst having a desire to protect the countryside. CWPC are about to go out to Regulation 14 consultation and are keen to come together with other parishes after Neighbourhood Plans have been adopted to try and reach a collective view on future development in and around Chippenham. A further meeting with Lacock is in the diary. RH asked if any notes were available from these meetings and NM responded that some bullet points could be provided for SG Members.</p> <p>NM added that the issue of ownership and maintenance of public footpaths had been raised by CPWC and it had been suggested that an informal working group be set up to maintain access and raise funds to improve footpaths. RH added that Wiltshire Council's Rights of Way department are under resourced so any help would be good. NM suggested Wiltshire Councillors have a meeting with Wiltshire Council's Rights of Way department before the election.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AP reported a change to the legislation on permitted development rights from April 21<sup>st</sup> allowing Class E uses to change to residential (Use Class C3) via the prior approval process. NP policies will need to be reviewed to ensure they can stand up to these changes. SG members expressed their concerns that the Town centre would suffer because of these changes, forcing businesses out of Town or on-line. AP agreed to share the link to the new permitted development rights.</li> <li>• CTC has responded to the revised NPPF and National Model Design Code consultation.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Actions:</u></b>  AC to provide bullet points of meetings held with neighbouring parishes  AP to share link to notification on changes to permitted development legislation.</p>
106.	<p><b><u>WALPA UPDATE</u></b></p> <p>AC reported that WALPA had received a reply from the Secretary of State for Housing to its March letter, but that the letter did not really respond to the questions posed. The next WALPA meeting is on 20 April 2021, with Sam Fox, Director of Development, Wiltshire Council. SG members should let AC know if they wish to attend.</p>
107.	<p><b><u>COMMENTS ON VERSION 4 OF DRAFT PLAN</u></b></p> <p>SG members were asked to provide any comments on Version 4 of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan &amp; Annexes 1-3, which have been revised as per amendments suggested by the Steering Group, the Planning Consultant and the Planning Officer to Version 3.</p> <p>AP said all the changes were helpful and looked good. No questions were asked. AC said the draft had gone to Wiltshire Planners last week and a meeting with them in April had been requested. It had also been sent to Town Councillors and to date no comments had been received.</p>

108.	<p><b><u>OUTSTANDING ITEMS FOR NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN</u></b></p> <p>SG members were asked to note and action the outstanding items which need to be resolved in order to progress the Neighbourhood Plan, as set out in the Outstanding Items Report. The following was noted:</p> <p>SCC3 - Standalone Renewable Energy: NM to correspond with contact at renewable energy company who has offered to review policy. Copy AC into correspondence.</p> <p>TC5 - Buildings of Local Merit: Further photos had been provided by JS and AC would send these to JK. JK working on building descriptions table and would send AC an example.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plan: SG members to send AC photos or upload to Google Drive.</p> <p>Design Guide - Existing Housing Design in Chippenham: Examples of good and bad design needed. SP thought the Sadlers Mead multi-storey car park would be a good example of bad design. AC suggested that it would be better to concentrate on housing examples since this was what the Design Guide was aimed at. AP added that if the car park was criticised it was important to be aware of the NP policy on Access for Disabled People and those with Reduced Mobility which talks about car parks. In her opinion there was no need to carry out more work on design since the NP was already so thorough on this. AC suggested a few paragraphs in the Design Guide to explain what kind of materials are typical in the town, such as Bath stone. JK suggested dissuading developers from using reconstituted stone. AP suggested a colour pallet could be used. NM thought examples within the Design Guide would be useful. JK and RH both wanted to see a variety of styles in the town. NM made the point that the town centre should have the same style of building, but that housing estates could incorporate different styles. SP mentioned that some developments have maintenance problems e.g. green walls which now look unsightly.</p> <p>RH and JK will work further on some paragraphs for the Design Guide and perhaps come up with a Chippenham design (theme). AP added that it was appropriate to have something about maintenance of façade materials but warned against criticising people's houses.</p> <p>Conservation Area Character Appraisal: JK is taking photos and will speak to AC about what to do with them.</p> <p><b><u>Actions:</u></b>  NM to correspond with contact at renewable energy company  AC to send JS photos for Policy TC5 to JK  JK to send AC an example for Policy TC5 for approval  SG members to send AC photos for NP or upload to Google Drive  RH and JK to meet to discuss the Design Guide  AC to contact JK re. photos for Conservation Area Character Appraisal</p>
109.	<p><b><u>OUTLINE STRATEGY FOR REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION</u></b></p> <p>SG members were asked to approve, or amend, the outline strategy for Regulation 14 public consultation as set out in Appendix 3 of the Communication and Engagement Strategy.</p>

AC reported that the Reg. 14 consultation would probably happen in June/July and the NP would have to be publicised for at least six weeks. SP queried how the consultation would be run. AC confirmed that depending on the pandemic restrictions at the time, it was hoped that the consultation would take place in person and on-line (hybrid). Responses from the public would be tabulated and all comments would need to be summarised and responded to. AP strongly recommended doing an online survey due to the number of responses expected and to avoid having to interpret open-ended responses.

NM asked what survey software would be used and AC replied that Community First Wiltshire had done a good job on the NP's Community Surveys so it would be best to commission them again and they can advise which software would be best to use. AP advised against asking them to analyse the responses to questions due to lack of planning knowledge.

Paper copies of the draft Plan would be made available at several locations. AP recommended that a request should be made by telephone for anyone who wants to obtain a paper copy. FW asked if it was acceptable for SG members to share links to the consultation on social media forums. LN confirmed that this would be acceptable. AC suggested bringing a draft copy of the survey back to the SG for approval in due course.

With regard to holding Zoom consultation meetings, NM felt that a Q&A session would not be ideal, instead just a short presentation, asking the public to submit any feedback on the survey form afterwards. DW added that a You-Tube video would be good as people could look at it more than once and at any time. It could include links to the consultation so that they could respond. CC suggested that there should be just one communication channel available if people don't understand the questions, but that formal feedback should only be given on the survey form. CC and NM both expressed the need to make it engaging and to use the right tone. RH suggested the Community Hub could be used as a base for the consultation. NM said the Town Hall was probably more appropriate as we have use of the facility already. AC summarised that a 15 minute You-Tube video be prepared with links to the survey, rather than a Zoom presentation. This was agreed and AC said he would liaise with LN on this.

SP asked how soon after the consultation would the referendum happen and AC confirmed it would be about a year after.

AC mentioned the Town Council Youth Council could be approached to discuss how to consult with schools.

AP confirmed that neighbouring parishes would need to be sent a notification by email that the NP is out for consultation. It was agreed that Calne, Corsham and Melksham should also receive an email.

AC and LN would now hone the consultation strategy and add dates/specifics.

**Actions:**

AC to include draft survey on next agenda

AC and LN further hone the consultation strategy to take back to the SG

Prior to the next item, SP declared a non-pecuniary interest, as stated above

110. **LOCAL GREEN SPACE ADDITION**

SG members were asked to consider for approval an addition, or enlargement, of proposed Local Green Space (LGS) of the field to the north of Hardens Mead and south of River Avon, as per the public request submission.

AC ran through the three options and explained why he considered option three the most sensible.

SP referred to a small piece of land between Hardens Mead and Long Close which he believed already had a protection in place. AC confirmed the piece of land had no planning status protection. DW asked if the larger area of land in question had been identified as a parcel for potential development under the Local Plan Review and AC replied that part of the land had and there could be issues with Wiltshire Council over this. DW said that all the parcels of land would have been identified in the land availability assessment and asked if this had been checked.

AP explained she didn't think the proposed LGS would meet the criteria in the NPPF and the Examiner probably would not accept it. NM said there was evidence of community use of the area given the public footpath that crosses the site. AP suggested a much smaller parcel of land might have greater chance of success because if the Examiner doesn't like the proposal, they will take out the whole allocation, not just part of it. She added that use by the Sea Cadets, the footpaths, the covenant, etc. could be mentioned to make a stronger case. AP advised keeping the space separate from the other proposed LGS nearby. She also advised to check that the land owner (Wiltshire Council) is happy with the proposal. It could be included and be considered as part of the Regulation 14 consultation, and if not successful could be removed before Regulation 15. NM suggested putting the proposal to Wiltshire Council Planners to test their feeling on this. AP added that an alternative, instead of designating as LGS, would be to look at whether the land could be afforded some protection under green buffer or green corridor policies. RH suggested that the parcel of land to the north of Abbeyfield's playing field should not be included. He agreed that the land should be included as a green buffer, taking the east-west line on the northern side of Abbeyfield playing field across. AP added that the playing field could be an LGS in addition to the land to the west, thus making a strong argument that they should be connected.

AC suggested that the LGS proposal be discussed further at the April meeting with Wiltshire Planners. DM questioned why this land needed to be protected, in favour of any other green spaces and didn't support the request.

NM suggested taking a vote on pursuing the LGS request, taking into account whether it is viable and the views of Wiltshire Council. AC asked if the vote should be on the original proposal put forward by the requestor. RH suggested a fall back position of the line he had previously mentioned.

NM summarised the proposal being voted on was to support the original request in principle and investigating its viability with Wiltshire Council, but be prepared to negotiate down.

A vote was taken and there being 8 votes in favour, 1 against and 1 abstention, the motion was carried.

111.	<p><b><u>ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update on meeting with Wiltshire Planners (to include feedback on LGS request)</li> <li>• Updates on commissioning Wiltshire Community First &amp; Ice House Design</li> <li>• Report back on Outstanding Items</li> <li>• Draft survey form</li> </ul> <p>AC and NM thanked the Administrative Services Officer - Planning for attending the SG meetings and taking the minutes, as this would be her last meeting.</p>
112.	<p><b><u>DATE/TIME OF NEXT MEETING</u></b></p> <p>CC asked if the next meeting scheduled for 4 May could be pushed back to the following week due to it being close to the election. AC expressed caution as it appeared that virtual meetings could not continue past 6 May. It was proposed that the May meeting be cancelled and all agreed. Accordingly, NM thanked all the Town Councillor SG members who would not be standing for re-election, and those who may or may not be present at the next meeting.</p> <p>Next meeting will be on 1 June 2021, 6pm, venue TBC</p>
	<p>The meeting finished at 7.45pm</p>