



Minutes of a meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group held virtually on Zoom, on Tuesday 2 February 2021 at 6pm

Steering Group Members Present:	
Cllr Clare Cape (CC)	Ross Henning (RH) (until 7.05pm)
Cllr Nick Murry (NM - Chairman)	David Mott (DM)
Cllr Mary Norton (MN)	Steve Perry (SP)
Cllr John Scragg (JS)	Dunstan Westbury (DW)
Cllr Sandie Webb (SW)	
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)	

78.	<u>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</u> There were apologies for absence from Councillor Ruth Lloyd, Jack Konynenburg and Fiona Williams.
79.	<u>DECLARATION OF INTEREST</u> No declaration of interest was received.
80.	<u>PROTOCOL FOR VIRTUAL MEETINGS OF THE NPSG</u> The Chairman ran through the Protocol for this virtual meeting.
81.	<u>MINUTES</u> The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 5 January 2021 were approved as a correct record.
82.	<u>CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS</u> There were no Chairman's Announcements
83.	<u>WALPA UPDATE</u> AC had attended the last meeting. A letter had been sent to Wiltshire Council Leadership and Wiltshire MP's in August and it was being proposed that a follow

	<p>up letter be sent on 10 February and a press release, asking Wiltshire Council/MPs to meet with WALPA. The PET Committee had agreed the Town Council could sign up to the latest letter. RH mentioned that at a recent Strategic Planning meeting, yet another unsuitable site had been passed. Any SG members interested in attending a meeting of WALPA should contact either AC or NM for details.</p>
84.	<p><u>GREEN BUFFER POLICY</u></p> <p>AP outlined the proposed Green Buffer policy and was thanked for an excellent piece of work. The policy was agreed, subject to some typing errors being corrected.</p> <p>SP questioned why it was not possible for the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) to argue against the additional 5,000 houses allocated to Chippenham, when the rate of growth in Chippenham requires about 300 per year. AP explained that the NPPF states that NPs should not undermine strategic policies, and this is definitely a strategic policy. The Housing Needs Assessment that the NP undertook was based on census data and a non-strategic policy was formulated from this. In terms of the overall Wiltshire housing figure the Standard Method, set out by the Government has been used. In addition, there is a higher figure based on Wiltshire's Local Housing Needs Assessment which projects economic growth, but this is not inappropriate. In relation to this higher figure, the fact that there is a shortage of housing land, according to the NPPF, indicates that it would not be inappropriate for Wiltshire Council to plan for a buffer in case the housing delivery test is not met. In terms of the large numbers of housing proposed to be allocated to Chippenham, Wiltshire Council have explained that other towns are more environmentally constrained so cannot take any more development. If the NPSG wanted to challenge this, it would have to retest all decisions in the Sustainability Appraisal and their decision making. AP advised against this as it would be inappropriate. The Town Council could challenge it but not the NP, which is excluded from dealing with strategic matters. NM added that the Sustainability Appraisal process is at a very early stage and can be challenged, but that the Neighbourhood Plan does not have the capacity to do this in the time available.</p>
85.	<p><u>COMMENTS ON VERSION 2 OF DRAFT PLAN</u></p> <p>AC outlined two key changes to the Draft Neighbourhood Plan & Annexe 1 (Chippenham Design Guide):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Text for Section 12 - Developer Contributions • Revision to Policy TC7 - Residential Uses in the Town Centre <p>Plus revisions made as per the amendments suggested by the Steering Group to Version 1, plus Planning Officer amendments. He thanked FW who had sent in a number of grammatical changes. All SG Members were asked to check the wording for their policy areas and send any further comments on Version 2 to AC by 16 February.</p> <p>NM asked why a list of NP projects that the Town Council would use its portion of CIL on, was not included in Section 12 of the NP. AC replied that the wording chosen around CIL was based on Farnham's NP and intended to strike a balance between setting out what the Town Council's CIL could be used on smaller scale,</p>

	<p>localised NP projects, and not committing it to things which it could not deliver. MK and AP advised that they thought the wording used was appropriate.</p> <p>AP reported that the government had issued a consultation on proposed changes to the NPPF yesterday, containing mainly additions about design and strengthening tree policies. The Design Guide may need to refer to the National Model Design Code and needs lots more photos to become a 'visual tool'. It was suggested that photos could be sourced from places such as the Museum, Heritage Centre, a Facebook page called Chippenham Then and Now (with permission) and from Ice-House Design.</p> <p><u>Actions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AC to send a reminder to SG Members to check wording in their policy areas in Version 2 of the Draft Plan • SP & RH to make a list of what photos are needed for the Design Guide
86.	<p><u>TIMELINE/PROCESS FOR LOCAL PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS</u></p> <p>MK outlined the timeline/process for two consultations being carried out by Wiltshire Council. The HIF Bid presentation had been made to full Council and a questionnaire had been sent to Councillors for completion and consideration at a Council meeting on 4 March. Comments from the SG on the Wiltshire Local Plan Review would go to the PET Committee meeting on 18 February and a recommendation would then be considered at a full Council meeting on 25 February. CC pointed out that the HIF Bid questionnaire did not include an option for 'none of the above' but it had been confirmed at a Cabinet meeting that it was possible to respond this way.</p>
	<p>At 7.50pm the Chairman proposed that the meeting be extended in order to finish business on the agenda and this was agreed.</p>
87.	<p><u>RESPONSE ON WILTSHIRE LOCAL PLAN REVIEW</u></p> <p>The SG discussed comments collected from the Steering Group, Planning Officer & Planning Consultant, outlined in the Comments on Local Plan Review, for inclusion in a report to the Town Council's Planning, Environment and Transport Committee meeting on 18 February 2021. AC ran through the document in detail and SG Members added comments for inclusion in the NP response. NM read out his draft responses to the Addressing Climate Change and Biodiversity Net Gain Paper which were also agreed by the SG subject to some additions from CC and DW.</p> <p>Action: AC to write up NP Response with additional comments made and circulate to SG members on Wednesday/Thursday. Final comments to be sent to AC by Sunday and draft to be presented to CMT on Monday.</p>
88.	<p><u>ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree any further modifications to draft Plan & Annexes • Pre-Reg 14 Consultation on draft Plan with surrounding Parishes, Wiltshire Council Planners, Town Councillors* • Update Communication and Engagement Strategy with a plan for Reg 14 Consultation <p>Action:</p>

	*AP suggested that AC check with WC first for approval before going public and request a workshop with officers to discuss the response and agree a work programme. Something to be drawn up before next meeting.
89.	<u>DATE/TIME OF NEXT MEETING</u> 2 March 2021, 6pm, Remote meeting
	The meeting finished at 8.15 pm