

Meeting date:	3rd August 2020	Project:	Royal Wootton Bassett Neighbourhood Plan Review
Meeting time:	3pm	Subject:	Meeting with Wiltshire Council Officers
Venue:	MS Teams		

	Name	Organisation
Attendees:	Alex Roberts	DLP Planning
	Kirsten Ward	DLP Planning
	Steve Walls	Royal Wootton Bassett Town Council
	Steve Bucknell	Royal Wootton Bassett Town Council
	Gill Welsman-Clarke	Royal Wootton Bassett Town Council
	Michelle Temple	Royal Wootton Bassett Town Council
	Georgina Clampitt-Dix	Wiltshire Council
	Henning Totz	Wiltshire Council
Apologies:	None	

Meeting Record	Action
Item 1 – Introductions	
Members of the DLP project team and Royal Wootton Bassett Town Council (RWBTC) were introduced to Wiltshire Council officers.	
Item 2 – Local Plan Review and Regional / Strategic Priorities	
<p><u>Timescales</u></p> <p>Updated LDS due to be published shortly. Plan was to undertake formal consultation on scope / strategy later this year, with pre-submission consultation next year. This now delayed due to Covid-19. Regulation 18 consultation likely to be pushed back.</p> <p><u>Emerging policies and priorities</u></p> <p>Wiltshire Council officers have previously had meetings with Town Council to discuss the draft strategic priorities. These have previously been shared confidentially with the Town Council – GW-C to circulate to DLP team.</p> <p>04.08.20 information sent to DLP Planning</p> <p>Strategic priorities are derived from adopted Core Strategy (Policy 19) and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning for area will remain holistic given proximity of RWB to Swindon. 	GW-C

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure delivery priorities e.g. Junction 16 and Sustrans network, primary education provision, new health centre, additional cemetery capacity. • Need to preserve distinct identity and character of settlement, including AONB to south and Community Forest. • Green Infrastructure Strategy is being developed. <p><u>Health care provision</u></p> <p>Wiltshire Council (WC) is in ongoing dialogue with CCG to check evidence base to ensure planned provision meets future needs.</p> <p>AR explained that looking at larger site allocations through the NDP may help to deliver more health care facilities. SB confirmed that GP surgeries in the local area have said they need more GPs, rather than more floor space. Opportunity for new health care centre within RWB may be an option for the NHS to take up in the future.</p> <p>GC-D to provide information on where investment may be needed in terms of health care / education provision, if available.</p> <p><u>Future Housing and Employment Land Requirements</u></p> <p>Option SW-B is indicative residual requirement for 1,000 dwellings and 6ha employment land in RWB.</p> <p>AR questioned whether there are any explicit requirements / quanta for different types of housing e.g. affordable housing? WC officers to provide breakdown of requirements when available.</p> <p><u>Development Sites</u></p> <p>WC currently going through site selection exercise for developments outside of town boundary (rather than within the town).</p> <p><u>Regional Priorities</u></p> <p>Housing and employment figures informed by Functional Economic Market Area (FEMA) assessment and Employment Land Review (ELR) for wider region. If there is a case for strategic exceptional development (e.g. at motorway junctions, Honda site) this might be considered appropriate, but policy not yet confirmed.</p> <p>Swindon Parkway Railway Station - could be considered a wider regional priority and is mentioned in draft strategic priorities for the plan.</p> <p>SB queried Great Western Powerhouse / Oxford-Cambridge Growth Arc ambitions for the unitary authority. HT said indicative employment requirements are locally-derived. Key point is to recognise RWB's strategic links with Swindon.</p> <p>SB said RWB is strategically located on M4 - has potential to become more than just a satellite commuter market town for Swindon. RWB could be promoted as an area for growth.</p> <p>Bypass - HT said this is unlikely to feature immediately in the Local Plan strategic priorities due to lack of current evidence re. viability and preferred route. This may be further developed in the next 6-12 months. LPA is open to engagement on this issue. SB indicated that growth of RWB will be severely constrained if bypass is not included in the Local Plan and queried what evidence would be needed to support a bypass and who should be responsible for providing this evidence, if not the LPA.</p> <p>RWBTC highlighted it is looking to allocate sites within the NDP and would like an indication of amount of strategic housing growth that will deliver the appropriate amount of infrastructure to support growth. RWBTC do not want to be constrained to</p>	<p>GC-D</p> <p>WC officers</p>
--	--	--------------------------------

	<p>allocating only 1,000 units (for example) as this would be a barrier to growth and provision of additional infrastructure.</p> <p>GC-D explained that overall housing growth in Local Plan is likely to be around 45,000 units (based on matching housing growth with jobs growth). WC is aware that there are some transport / infrastructure issues around RWB that would need to be dealt with.</p> <p>HT said that NDP could identify further allocations in addition to strategic allocations brought forward through Local Plan. AR said that the RWB NDP should be able to identify housing sites within the NDP area if WC provide a housing requirement figure. There was some disagreement on this issue as HT did not agree that this was the allowed under national planning policy. AR said it is possible for the WC strategic policies to enable NDPs to allocate sites at any scale and precedent for this has been set elsewhere.</p> <p>It was agreed that further discussion between RWBTC and WC would be beneficial as the NDP Review is progressed.</p>	
Item 3 – Reflections on existing Neighbourhood Plan		
	<p>AR queried the extent to which the current NDP is used in determination of applications - HT and GC-D to pick this up with Development Control colleagues if possible and report back to RWBTC.</p> <p>Marsh Farm appeal decision – the RWB NDP was identified as a ‘material consideration’ although because the appeal site lies outside the Neighbourhood Plan area it is not part of the development plan for the appeal site.</p> <p>Further example – site of around 57 units, former depot on Marlborough Road to south of RWB (land owned by Wiltshire Council) where application was withdrawn – RWBTC expressed views on connectivity of development with the town.</p> <p>RWBTC want to ensure that future NDP is taken seriously as part of development plan by Development Control officers at Wiltshire Council. HT said they were not aware that this was not currently the case.</p> <p>GC-D confirmed there is currently no explicit monitoring of NDPs in the Local Plan’s AMR. The LPA encourages Town Councils to monitor and review their own plans.</p>	HT / GC-D
Item 4 – Objectives for Neighbourhood Plan Review		
	<p>Strategic priorities for RWBTC include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RWB should not be joined with Swindon and should remain physically distinct. • Infrastructure is a key priority - railway station, bypass and health centre. • Landscape setting of the town should be used to control direction of growth. <p>GW-C to send footfall survey data to DLP, when Skewbridges closed for Network Rail electrification work and traffic diverted from High Street.</p> <p>07.08.20 information sent to DLP Planning</p>	GW-C
Item 5 – Engagement with Wiltshire Council going forward		
	<p>It was agreed that RWBTC and Wiltshire Council will need to work closely together going forwards.</p> <p>It was highlighted that the NDP may come forward before Local Plan.</p>	All

Item 6 – AOB

Next steps – AR confirmed that the NDP Review scoping exercise is scheduled to be completed by October 2020.

WC to determine and confirm who will be the link officer for the RWB NDP. HT to be contact in the meantime.

SB queried process for RWBTC to access CIL money. 25% of CIL receipts generated in the CIL area can be given to RWBTC. GC-D to check what, if anything, should have been received to-date (any development approved prior to becoming a CIL charging authority is not liable for CIL).

GC-D confirmed that Reg 123 list for infrastructure is being replaced in December by an Infrastructure Funding Statement. CIL Charging Schedule may be updated alongside Local Plan.

WC

GC-D