

Minutes

Steering Group Meeting Tuesday 21st November 2017 at 7.45pm, The Parish Church Room

Attending: Peter Topping, Martin Livermore, Emma Powlett, Pam Freeman, Arthur Greaves, Alan Oswald, Tim Stone, Rob Foden, Ashley Arbon, Jo Denny (Administrative Assistant)

Apologies: Ken Winterbottom, Sophie O'Hara Smith, Amanda Thorn

1. Review of meeting with SCDC

Points from meeting. The Neighbourhood Plan need maps, it needs to be more Whittlesford specific, do not need to repeat the Local Plan (LP), ensure a person with no knowledge of Whittlesford can understand everything.

Alan Oswald (AO) We need to sell the plan to the village and we don't want to repeat the LP, but will need to explain to residents if certain issues are already dealt with in the LP

Martin Livermore (ML) We can do this in the text in the evidence document or footnotes.

Peter Topping (PT) Ensure National Guidance is not repeated in NP. Is this an issue now?

Ashley Abon (AA) We need to explain the LP and then make our policies local to Whittlesford.

Peter Topping (PT) If NP is not consistent with LP and other guidance it is not going to work.

AA The Parish Council should put a local view on applications. Maps will help with applications, for example permitted developments should not be built within 3km from Duxford Airfield. This has not happened in the past.

PT There is a difference between a simple document and a complicated document that is understood. Simple messages for residents to understand.

Pam Freeman (PF) It is helpful to look at other NP's that have been made. Most are simple but very informative.

PT How do we make the draft NP Whittlesford specific.

ML The notes from South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) should help with this.

Jo Denny (JD) Alison Talkington has said we should receive their written comments by the end of this week.

PT Once we have the detailed commentary, the facilitators can work through the comments and existing draft NP. Whatever differences there are on the draft NP, everyone has worked very hard and we can take comfort that the NP is in the right direction.

Emma Powlett (EP) One of the consultants has said that he can't see our "Vision", that we are a tale of two villages. This needs to be considered.

PF Yes, we do and also the number of policies we have.

PT We do now need a consultant for an independent view on the issues we are trying to resolve. Can provide guidance. EP view is recognised.

AO – Ken Winterbottom (KW) who is not here this evening, emailed suggesting the draft NP should be reviewed by a smaller group (if not all members wanted to be involved) before it goes to a consultant. KW offered to be part of this.

PF Her concern is that we spend a lot more time on the draft NP when we should now be instructing a consultant. Many other villages undertaking plans instructed a consultant from the beginning.

PT Do we need to discuss before goes to a consultant?

AA Thinks that we need to get together to go through each section and make sure we all agree with the direction of the policies.

PF Agreed there is a lot of repetition but again is reluctant to do much more work ahead of appointing a consultant.

TS We have no distinct vision for Whittlesford, as EP said earlier. For decades SCDC has made Whittlesford a group village, which has protected us from over-development and has concentrated the full range of services in larger settlements such as Sawston. Some villagers agree with this, which means only build a few affordable houses for people with a direct link to Whittlesford. That is about all the flexibility that the emerging LP permits. Others believe in more development. The draft NP fudges the issue as it talks about "provide the types and styles of housing that are needed" and "appropriate infrastructure". We need to be clear what the village actually wants, what it is allowed to have and then express its views, so all readers understand.

We cannot contradict the emerging LP – only localise and reinforce it. So, while great crested newts are legally protected, we have added precise planning rules. SCDC and the Wildlife Trust agreed with our view.

PT There are a range of different views around the table. It should be borne in mind this is not a 50-year plan.

ML Does the group village status in the LP apply to the whole Parish?

TS Yes

[ML following the meeting researched this issue and believes it only applies to the Village of Whittlesford. If not then the SCDC would be going against its only policy by allowing larger developments in Royston Road, Moorfield Road and Station Road – clarification of this will need to be sought].

PF Some residents suggested joining the 2 parts of the village by infilling down Duxford Road, but this is difficult as this is greenbelt.

ML My view is that most people consulted wanted Whittlesford to retain its essentially rural nature, despite the apparent desire to join the two parts of the parish.

2. Updates by facilitators to include E & H Group's latest meeting on the 20.11.2017

Community Assets & Infrastructure – AO has nothing to report as yet as there was no verbal feedback at the meeting with SCDC on the draft. He is waiting for the written comments. He confirmed that the group only has himself and one other member.

Transport – PF Nothing to report at this stage, again waiting for comments from SCDC. She has contacted SCDC regarding the proposed transport hub and will arrange to meet with them if we are successful. A Parish Council workgroup is looking at cycle paths, developer's contributions, repairs and maintenance, road safety and speed limits.

EP SCDC at the meeting advised that if we want additional recreational space as part of any developer's contribution we need to be specific as to where.

Housing and Rural Development – ML He has sent around amended draft following meeting with SCDC for comment to his workgroup but will now wait for written comments from SCDC before doing anything further.

Environment & Heritage – TS Following meeting with SCDC he met with the Wildlife Trust and SC. He received positive feedback to the draft section. Have made various amendments which his group have now discussed at a meeting on Monday 20th November.

3. Grant Application and Consultants Update (Query by AA, how do we decide on which consultant and who will the contract be with?)

General query as to what is the guidance on who we can instruct, i.e. cheapest quote. JD to check this

TS What do we expect a consultant to do? For example, do we want them to tell us if certain policies should be included for example electric car charging points in new builds or just ensure that what we say is in correct planning speak?

It was agreed that as a Steering Group we need to all be in agreement to our policies before a consultant is appointed and that a consultant would not come up with new policies.

JD to try and obtain original grant application from Locality.

Grant may also be needed for maps if SCSC can't help.

PT Aim to have grant money by Christmas so that we are ready to instruct someone in January 2018.

JD to arrange a date (week commencing 4th December preferably in the day) with the Steering Group to go through comments by SCDC and review all sections of the NP to ensure agreement.

ML Facilitators to work on their sections prior to the meeting, written comments by members of the SG to be provided in advance of the meeting.

JD to check rules for choosing an expert.

EP Formal process is to have a scoring process and then the SG to vote.

AO will prepare scoring process based on a number of issues, to include local knowledge and availability. Will send this around to the SG for members to score.

PT Once chosen this will then be put to the Parish Council for agreement as the contract will be with them. Either Tuesday 28th Finance Meeting or next Parish Council meeting on the 12 December.

4. Maps

TS Has a lot of paper maps that are accurate and make sense but when bring to A4 size for the NP are illegible. A3 has been suggested by Sophie O'Hara Smith (SOS). SCDC in August gave a list of queries it needed answering before it could see if it could help, but responses received less than complete.

Facilitators to provide answers to these questions by the next meeting.

EP suggested that the group spoke to Peter Fane on the Great Shelford NP to see if they can provide any useful information. Good to share another groups knowledge.

PT agreed to speak to them.

PF suggested to speak to Cambridgeshire Acre regarding maps too. (JD will action)

TS clarified that we are discussing maps for the draft NP itself. Any maps for future consultations can be sorted later, easier to make maps bigger, the challenge is to make them small enough while retaining clarity.

5. AOB (Housing Infrastructure Fund and Utility Companies)

Housing and Infrastructure Fund – Nothing in there for Whittlesford.

Utilities – Will utility companies cope with additional development. Agreed not relevant for NP, but information may be useful.

Summary by PT of action required and next steps

- We should have written comments by SCDC by next week (w/c 27th November).
- Facilitators to action comments and send around to SG for written feedback
- PT to talk to Great Shelford NP re maps
- SG to meet w/c 4th December to discuss amended drafts and maps required
- Martin to undertake Grant Application by end of November
- SG to agree consultant to use, Parish Council to approve and January consultant to begin work

Date for next meeting

JD to arrange w/c 4th December.

Agreed no need for future workshops but will require consultation drop in's similar to Red Lion event. Suggestion Bees in the Wall, Social Club. Consider this for February once consultants advice and any amendments made.