

## **CHEDDINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

### **PLANNING WORKSHOP: 24 JULY 2014**

#### **Housing & Development Theme Notes:**

Three key issues:

- Location
- Type/tenure
- Design

#### Location:

- Two scenarios: 'connect the two parts of the village' and 'grow the main village'
- The first focuses on land along Station Road between the cluster of buildings near the station access and the Mentmore Road junction, and includes the orchard land towards the church – it would comprise not only new housing sites but also the replacement/improvement of community facilities and car parking
- The second focuses on delivering a number of small housing sites on the edge of the main village area
- The first would include one or more of the following sites: 18, 20, **21**, 22, 24, **25** and **28A** (on attached plan) + one/two small brownfield site within the station area (not on plan) – land known to be available for development in **bold**
- The second would include one or more of the following sites: 7, 16, **17**, 18, 20, **21** and **35**
- In both cases, there would be more than enough available land to meet a perceived suitable and acceptable housing number of 50-100 new homes in the period 2014 – 2029, provided enough land is confirmed as being available in the plan period by the land owners
- It was accepted that the village should be regarded as a 'larger village' in the AVDC settlement hierarchy as it does have a school, shop, pub, church, village hall, recreation ground and station
- It is known that the former Vale of Aylesbury Plan (VAP) had supported c.50 homes at Cheddington and that it is likely the new Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP) will require more from the 'larger villages'
- It was noted that the school is at capacity but that it was unlikely the education authority would object to housing development of this scale – other, non-planning ways of managing school places may be addressed – it was also noted that there appears to be no means of increasing the school capacity to 1.5FE or 2FE, nor a local desire to do so
- The benefits of the first scenario are (in no order): 'make one village', close to the station for commuters, lower landscape sensitivity, deliver new car parking, traffic management to Station Road, replacement scout hut, new car park for church, transfer of orchard to community ownership to manage successfully, new footpath on Station Road to walk from main village to station
- The weaknesses of the scenario are: busier Station Road, loss of orchard, loss of countryside, development close to pylons, development close to railway line, won't be able to fund traffic calming in main village
- The benefits of the second scenario: sites in walking distance of shop, school, rec etc, smaller sites will finish off some parts of the village, may pay for traffic calming on Mentmore Road/High Street
- The weaknesses of the scenario are: 'village cramming', loss of glimpses to countryside, loss of local character and amenity

### Type/Tenure

- Evidence of current house types and prices shows clear deficit of 'lower-middle market' 2/3 bed homes suited to younger households moving in or up and to 'downsizing' older households wanting to stay in the village
- Smaller sites developed by local/regional builders are more likely to deliver these types of homes
- Affordability problems are common in the general area – there are no special issues in the village that are not faced by other local villages but the supply of smaller homes, including flats, will broaden the mix of local homes types which is currently skewed towards larger, detached homes
- Therefore probably want to ensure as many sites as possible are >14 homes to trigger the AVDC affordable housing policy
- Some interest in self-build homes as part of larger sites

### Design

- No current Village Design Statement but there are a number of principles of good design that are specific to Cheddington – these principles should be defined in a simple character analysis report (Parish Council, History Society and AVDC?)
- Important that car parking standards are applied to ensure more than one space per dwelling
- Site allocations should ensure existing footpaths are retained or better permeability through the village can be achieved



**Cheddington Neighbourhood Plan**  
**Planning Workshop – 24<sup>th</sup> July 2014.**  
**Notes on Housing (2)**

- Numbers; 50 if the mix is correct (ward homes development – Brownlow Lane area is a good example of mix. Church Hill is a bad design with large houses at the entrance and small houses crowded in at the back)
- Type; no second or third homes; Good mix in types to keep it inclusive 2 and 3 bedroom semi detached; Must include first time buyer properties possibly flats (maisonettes) to meet affordable requirements.
- Adequate off street parking 1 space per bedroom and adjacent to property.
- Housing for the elderly including sheltered housing, if provided, would free up housing for families. Put covenants within the deeds to stop them being extended
- Adequate gardens and outside green spaces.
- Adequate lighting for foot ways.
- Sites; Preferable plots 16, 17, 21, 25, 32, 35
- Unique affordable housing allocations to the village
- Limit max numbers per site
- Possible ribbon development down Station Road but need to avoid urban sprawl
- Move scout hut
- No houses under pylons
- Possible community right to build order for scout hut possibly on the recreation ground
- Designs standards (BREEAM very good)
- Encourage solar electricity. (solar tiles – not panels)
- Possible community heating schemes (eco thermal)
- Rain water harvesting and grey water reuse
- Properties to have a very high water efficiencies (very low use) water discharge lower than 80 litres per day
- RIBA space standards
- Include integral bird and bat boxes in new homes.
- Partridge Close is a good example of design for a rural exception scheme.