

**Whittlesford Neighbourhood Plan
Steering Group Meeting
Wednesday 17th October 2018, 7.00pm**

Present: Alan Oswald (AO), Ashley Arbon (AA), Tim Stone (TS), Martin Livermore (ML), Pam Freeman (PF), Peter Topping (Chair) Trudie Davidson (TD) (Administration Assistant), Rachel Hogger (Visitor)

Apologies: Emma Powlett, Rob Foden, Arthur Greaves, Ken Winterbottom

1. Minutes from last meeting

AA noted that point 7 on PT's notes at last meeting was not agreed.

Group discussed need to be more assertive in what the plan says. Need for it to stand up to legal interpretation further down the line.

PT noted that there have already been a planning proposal submitted for large housing development on Greenbelt land. It was rejected but it does indicate that there are people who will try.

AA reiterated that in theory the depot site should not be changed from an employment site to non-employment under the Local Plan.

PF asked about possible development along the London to Cambridge corridor. PT was not aware but there will be inevitable pressure on the area.

AA noted the scrapyards development which has now been agreed will also have an affect on the south of the village.

Plan at present does not allocate specific sites for development. Need to be clear that this is the best action.

PF noted the need to look at wording around Granta site to ensure consistency.

2. Context Update

PT apologised for absence at last meeting but had been looking through the Plan and also that of Histon and Impington. Also noted that SCDC would be happy to look at the preliminary draft for feedback.

PT noted there will be a mini-review of the Local Plan in 2019-20 which could include an assessment of the Greenbelt and it would be beneficial to have the Plan in place by then.

Rachel Hogger joined the meeting.

<p>3. Mapping</p>	
<p>PT reiterated Samantha Johnson's offer regarding maps. AA concerned that she is only offering A4/A3 copies and there is a need for a larger scale (1:1250) and higher resolution.</p> <p>TD had collated requests and looked at maps we have. These are all jpg or pdf versions.</p> <p>Action: TD will circulate maps and requests to group to take to Samantha. Samantha will provide base OS map.</p> <p>AA requested a meeting with Samatha as hadn't met previously.</p> <p>Supporting Local Plans document has section on maps – Action: TD to look at this.</p> <p>Issue still with whether to use interactive maps for online version.</p> <p>Could have one map with everything on and then close ups for specific details – ie ditches.</p>	<p>TD</p> <p>TD</p>
<p>4. Summer Events</p>	
<p>PT queried whether there was enough in the Plan at present to reflect the issues attendees at the roadshows had.</p> <p>Most feedback appeared to be more 'general'.</p> <p>PF noted there would be the need for a Consultation Statement which would include information on who had been consulted and details of how and the key issues raised and how they were responded to. SG should be keeping a record of what had been done so far.</p> <p>Action: TD to check with Jo whether a consultation statement had been started.</p> <p>Action: PT to add a commentary about what we did in the summer to the Plan and also to send this to RH as an update.</p> <p>Group discussed need to gather comments on the Policies – possibly use the Parish Council Facebook page.</p>	<p>TD</p> <p>PT</p>
<p>5. Re-engaging the community</p>	
<p>AO has produced mock-up of leaflet. Group discussed how to use this to engage the village.</p> <p>RH suggested that as the wording of the Plan would probably change it might be worth waiting to use the leaflet prior to pre-submission.</p> <p>Action: TD to check if any grant money left over and amount</p>	

<p>that could still be applied for. TD noted any money received now would have to be spent by end of March 2019. AA request a full financial breakdown of the Plan's income and expenditure so far. Action: TD will request from Marie.</p>	<p>TD</p> <p>TD</p>
<p>PF noted the group will also need to submit a Basic Conditions Statement outlining how the basic conditions have been met. This is an opportunity to question ourselves and ensure it is right.</p>	
<p>PT suggested he would put a Powerpoint on the website with a narrative about the plan. Action: PT to forward to TD for website</p>	<p>PT/TD</p>
<p>RH noted there was an option for an independent assessment which was recommended by SCDC. Cost could be around £300 per day and would probably take 4 days including one day 'on the ground' looking around the village.</p>	
<p>Action: PT to ask about the Masterplan. Rural Travel Hub due November.</p>	<p>PT</p>
<p>6. NP note circulated previously.</p>	
<p>TS had some questions: If Greenbelt land is to be allocated can we say where? RH responded that if the mini-review changes then the NP can start allocating. Does Housing Needs Survey need updating. ML responded that the survey was now 2 years old and should be valid for 3 years. Can we put in a light pollution policy as per Winchfield? ML suggested this would be difficult to agree on. Denstone Plan – Rural Exception Housing Policy – Action: ML will have a look.</p>	<p>ML</p>
<p>Group discussed some issues with the introduction: 'Aging population' – where is the evidence for this specifically as the school was over subscribed. Ledo Road 'conspicuous by their absence' needs to come out. Issue with the use of 'Whittlesford Bridge'. It was separate in Local Plan of 2004 but is not now. It should not be treated as different. PT noted it is different in terms of constraints.</p>	
<p>7. Feedback from Rachel</p>	
<p>RH suggested that one person be responsible for the final document and that group had to trust that person to feedback the need for editing or rewriting. Action: PT has started and will continue to review the document.</p>	<p>PT</p>
<p>RH has limited capacity to take on any consultancy work. She will speak with Cambridge ACRE and another consultant who may be available and is independent and has knowledge of Rural Hub work. They need to have an understanding of the SG work over the summer (see above Summer Events).</p>	

<p>RH noted all age groups need to be consulted and this needs reporting on.</p> <p>Policies should relate to specific requirements. Show intention and question why? Must have evidence. Cannot be ambiguous and need to spell it out. RH suggested groups swap sections and test them out.</p> <p>Housing policies appear to be missing. Action: TD/ML to investigate.</p> <p>PT reiterated need to keep moving forward with some urgency. Rough timeline drawn up – was this realistic? Plan is not ready in present state for SCDC to have a preliminary look.</p> <p>RH will send TD a proposal at end of October after speaking to Cambridge ACRE and colleague.</p>	<p>TD/ML</p>
---	--------------