

CHEDDINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP

Notes of Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting

Thursday 23rd October 2014 – VH side rooms

Present Rob Grant, Margret Smith, Christine Fee, Ann Tarbox, Derek Town, Amie Town, Andrew Docherty, Peter Collins, Sandra Jenkins, Kathryn Coulson, Mark Coulson, Peter Cooper, Val Cooper, David Finch, Tom Hallet, Neil Homer.

Apologies Chris Poll

Chairman Rob chaired the meeting

Public Event – Friday 26th September – Rob gave a brief review of this event. About 190 attended. Outcome of questionnaire is ;

		For	Against	Partial	Not answered
Site 7	Field - r/o Leeches & Gooseacre	8	61	7	6
Site 21	Part of orchard from Stn Rd to Church Hill	40	17	17	8
Site 35	Land adj Croft Meadow	29	26	20	7
Site 16 & 17	Barkham Close & Partridge Close	40	16	13	13
Site 18	Field Mentmore Rd / L Marston Rd	26	32	6	18
Site 22	Field Mentmore Rd / Stn Road	34	26	12	10

SEA letter

- 1 SEA letter has been agreed and sent out to consultees.

AVDC Forum on VALP 16th October

- 2 Derek attended this forum. AVDC hope to get the VALP completed by 2017. It will span 2013 – 2031. Developments of less than 5 dwellings will not be considered. AVDC are still in support of Neighbourhood Plans but due to limited resources are unable to offer help in compiling Cheddington's NP. 40% of all developments will be Affordable Housing. **Derek** will forward further notes from the forum.
- 3 Neil commented that when a Neighbourhood Plan is complete it will be the most important policy that AVDC has to go by when determining planning applications. It will stay that way until AVDC have an approved VALP, some aspect of which could be contradictory. The NP would over-rule the 'old' adopted Plan.

Protecting Views

- 4 Neil recommended defining a settlement boundary. Views outside this the boundary will be protected as they would be in the countryside. Views inside the

boundary could be designated as green spaces; could be identified as important views to be protected; or protected and retained in any development. It is important to identify key views to the countryside and to specify that any development does not prejudice these views. Another option is to choose sites that do not affect these views or to build in areas of a site that does not affect a view.

Site 7 – Field r/o Leeches Way / Gooseacre

- 5 Residents have noted that surveys are being undertaken on this site. Christine has rung Gladman's to ask about the surveys. Notes from phone call;
- Preliminary survey work – Due diligence work.
 - Have land owner's permission to do this survey work.
 - Topographical survey.
 - Ecological survey.
 - Geographical survey – for Archaeology. This consists of a large box which is a ground penetrating radar which looks for archaeology under the soil.
 - "Trial Trenching" will also be done to determine if archaeology items are present. This is done by using a digger, inform residents that if a digger is in the field it is not the start of development work. It is to do infiltrating testing.
 - Transport consultant will do traffic counts. Not sure if the current traffic counts in the village are these consultants or not. Not aware of traffic surveys being done yet but they are part of the scope of surveys which will be undertaken.
 - These surveys are being done as part of the process which will lead to a proposal for the site being made.
 - It is envisaged that a planning application will be submitted – possibly in early 2015.
 - Before this application is submitted they will give notice to the village and hold a public meeting and approach the NP and or the PC.

This site is designated as a Local Landscape Area on the old adopted Local Plan as it is relatively close to a Site of an Ancient Monument. It is considered unlikely that AVDC would approve any development on such a site. Any decision will probably not be made until April 2015 at the earliest as the decision process would be prolonged by objections.

Policies

- 6 Clarify policy on views. Need a plan which shows sites and describing them.
- 7 If it is intended to allocate part of Site 35 (SMV land) for an extension to the School the NP would probably have to allocate another SMV site in the village to compensate. The LEA would have to purchase land or possibly a land transfer under a S106 agreement. However, the S106 regime is tightening in April 2015

with CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) intended to take over – AVDC does not have a CIL charging schedule at present.

- 8 Neil advised that if the CNP want to allow for the extension of the School then one approach would be to part allocate site 35 for development. However, he later indicated that there may be a way to secure provision/funding from other sites.
- 9 Neil recommended not insisting on a 15 dwelling maximum per site as it could be detrimental to other objectives.
- 10 Affordable Housing - suggest 35% on sites of 15 and above.
- 11 Low carbon housing will be a building regulations matter not a planning policy.
- 12 With regard to car parking spaces, if we ask for one per bedroom this may draw an objection from AVDC or Bucks CC. Suggest a compromise with a minimum of 2 spaces and larger houses having more spaces and if there are objections the suggested allocation can be withdrawn (items can be deleted but cannot add things later).
- 13 Water and electricity supplies cannot be included in policies as the developer should contact each provider to check suitability and capability of supply.
- 14 Green Spaces; An evidence base is needed to define green space sites. As a separate (but accompanying) document a survey of site is needed showing name, size, photographs etc. This can be a simple document but should show how the area would comply with criteria in Para 77 of NPPF.

Possible scenarios for development

- 15 There is no clear indication from residents as to whether the village as a whole would prefer that the two aspects of the village be joined up by developing along Station Road, or whether the village would prefer spreading development around the village.
- 16 As it is likely that any new VALP could possibly double its housing allocation it was suggested that Cheddington should allocate up to 100 dwellings. Therefore this makes limiting sites to 15 dwellings impractical and may restrict other benefits.
- 17 It is a planning judgement that there is no absolute technical method to allocate sites, but things like physical characteristics, constraints, availability of land and the politics of the village should be included, together with practicalities such as distance from the shop. Instinctively the SG will know what will and what will not work and not to try to determine by other methods.
- 18 In respect of the two scenarios;
 - “Join Up” would be to allocate Sites 21, 22, 24, 25, 28a – all with partial development to produce up to about 100 dwellings;

- “Main Village” would be to allocate Sites 21, 16, 17, 18, 35 – again with partial development to produce up to 100 dwellings.
- 19 The proviso to the “Join Up” scenario would be to include improvements to the Orchard, a car parking area and Scout hut site provision.
 - 20 The SG to confirm the status of site 28a, in regard to the suggestion of partial allocation.
 - 21 Site 22 would be for frontage development only.
 - 22 Suggest a public event in November to put these scenarios to residents;
 - a. Put together an exhibition of scenarios.
 - b. Ask residents to choose one or other scenario by way of voting paper.
 - c. Exhibition to be more than one day.
 - d. Exhibition to show pros and cons of each scenario.

Next meeting

- 23 To be confirmed.

Policies

- 24 To be clarified, by rCOH, before next meeting.

The meeting closed at 10.20 pm