

WEST WICKHAM, CAMBRIDGESHIRE ("the Village")  
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN ("NP")

Minutes of meeting of Neighbourhood Plan (NP) Working Group (WG)  
7.30pm Tuesday 9<sup>th</sup> October 2018 at 49 Burton End

PRESENT:

Andrew Morris (AMo)  
Arthur Mawby (AMa)  
David Sargeant (DS - Minute Taker)  
Georgina Magin (GM)  
Janet Morris (JM)  
Trevor Hall (TH - Chair)

APOLOGIES:

Simon Blackwell (SB)

1. GROUP COMMUNICATIONS

1.1 To aid members reviewing documents in Dropbox it was agreed to send an email note around when adding or updating important documents.

1.2 TH is going to find out whether James Midwood or Brian Upton wish to remain on the working group and on the email list.

2. CHARACTER ASSESSMENT (CA)

2.1 The final draft of the character assessment has been distributed to the Parish Council and approved.

2.2 One comment concerning the phrasing around the success of attempts to replicate vernacular architecture was considered by the working group but rejected.

2.3 It was noted that the mobile Post Office at the Village Hall is now shut and the reference to it will be removed.

2.4 GM raised the environment statement and whether it should be in the character assessment. It was agreed that such a statement is an important part of the plan and should support the Environment policies directly instead of being part of the CA.

2.5 Red Graphic have agreed to progress work at risk and will invoice us when the grant application is complete.

**ACTION** TH & AMo are going to arrange to visit Red Graphic in the coming weeks.

3. GRANT APPLICATON

3.1 DS presented the proposed grant application from our last meeting to the Parish Council who agreed they were acceptable. This was included approximately 10 days consultancy from ACRE at an estimated £400/day.

3.2 TH has corresponded with Mark Deas at ACRE who suggested that not all our proposed work would fit in their schedule (or probably ours). In light of this we proposed to revise the grant application only to cover the 7 days proposed work for 'Phase 1'. This covers amenity provision; scoping a development expectation; limited road safety consultancy and support at a village hall open day to consult on a wider set of objectives.

3.3 It is proposed that plan production will follow in a later 'Phase 2' with support for the WG writing all policies except planning which ACRE will produce for the WG to review.

**ACTION** TH to liaise with Mark to clarify our revised grant proposal will only apply to Phase 1 activities and get proposed dates for the training session.

3.4 Using ACRE to consult on additional community space/village hall expertise is still controversial within the WG. GM thinks that any additional provision while desired by the community will not receive adequate volunteer support in the long term to sustain its effective use. TH thinks it isn't the WGs role to decide it isn't possible, but we should see whether the plan can enable this (or other) community desires. DS thinks it is also important to have identified and evidenced projects to make sure any S106 payments from windfall sites comes to the parish and aren't withheld by SCDC.

3.5 It was agreed that the final plan needs to be distributed to each household and this cost will not be covered by the SCDC as part of the formal consultation or organising the referendum. This could run to around £1000 (i.e £5 per copy).

3.6 TH reassured the working group that any funds unspent in this grant interval could be returned and claimed again in a subsequent bit up to a maximum total grant of £9000.

3.7 The WG approve the bid and TH and AMa will proceed with the online application.

3.8 No further expenditure is approved until our grant application success has been confirmed.

#### 4. AOB

4.1 AMo noted that we need to engage with businesses and land owners in the parish as we have largely missed this group in our engagements so far. This was agreed although no concrete steps were discussed at this time.

4.2 JM presented her thorough review of the policies and structures used by a variety of adopted neighbourhood plans. This was very useful in getting a feel of what made plans can achieve.

4.3 After some debate it was agreed that the structure of the Yarcombe plan was our favourite in terms of breaking the plan down into:

- (i) Natural environment (lead GM)
- (ii) Built & historic environment (lead JM)
- (iii) Population and housing (lead DS)
- (iv) Community facilities (lead TH)
- (v) Transport, Road Safety & Accessibility (AMo & SB)
- (vi) Economy and employment (lead TH).

#### 6. NEXT MEETING

6.1 Next meeting will be on at 1930 on **6th November 2018** at 49 Burton End

6.2 Subsequent meetings are planned for the 4<sup>th</sup> December and 8<sup>th</sup> January 2019.

Meeting closed 9.45pm