

## STEWKLEY PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

### MINUTES OF A MEETING OF A

### STEERING GROUP MEETING

**MONDAY 11 DECEMBER 2017 AT VICARAGE FARM**

**Present:**

Neil Dickens (ND) – Chairman  
Jenny Wodey (JW) – PC Chair  
Gill Morgan (GM) – PC Councillor  
Paul Smith (PS) – PC Councillor  
Lorraine Chappell (LC)  
Janette Eustace (JE)  
Steve Nicholl (SN)

**ITEM**

**ACTION/DECISION**

**1 Apologies for Absence:**

Apologies had been received from Margaret Burgess, Andrew Pryke and Emma Galvin.

**2 Minutes of meeting on 20 November 2017.**

There were no objections to the minutes and actions/decisions were considered in the next item. There was however discussion of the effective publication in the minutes of the decision to exclude unseen the late poll entries (Item 4 Minutes of meeting Monday 20 November 2017). The meeting unanimously held to the rationale for exclusion expressed in those minutes.

**3 Matters Arising & Actions to be taken.**

- a. HELP Report. There has been no further progress by the HELP Working Group. Yet the overall Neighbourhood Plan must justify the criteria and processes by which policies in this area were formulated and justify the reduction in sites from over 50 to the 13 recommended. GM had earlier produced a summary of the whole process of site selection. This could provide the core of the HELP report. Paul Jobson should be able to provide guidance on what else might be needed. Action: ND to forward GM's summary to Paul Jobson (PJ) to get advice on what else is necessary.
- b. Green Spaces Report. The report has been completed No Further Action

and is now available on the website.

currently

- c. Review of Objectives and Recommendations. To be considered under Item 4 below.
- d. Progress on SEA. JE has completed the 'scope' of the SEA. This represents the vast majority of the work to complete the SEA. The scope has been forwarded to the statutory consultees. No Further Action pending consultee responses.
- e. AVDC consultation on Sites and Boundary. AVDC have elected not to comment in writing but in a face-to-face meeting. This was warmly welcomed by the steering group as improving the depth of communication.
- f. Site Templates. All site templates have been completed, including measurements, housing density etc. There appears to be no meaningful definition of housing density on a small site with access to larger spaces. The templates have been forwarded to AVDC and Paul Jobson with no adverse comment to date.
- g. Parish use of any receipts from new developments. It had been hoped that this would be discussed by the SPC. However, at its last meeting the SPC had had to defer the discussion.
- h. Circulation of Denison Meeting Minutes. The minutes had been circulated. Unfortunately, the file format could not be opened by several SG members' computers. Action: ND to try to convert to another format.
- i. Site 20 Developers. "Village Properties" have proposed a development of 18 houses on the site. ND has forwarded to our original 8-house proposal as better fitting our proposed policies. Action awaiting AVDC response.
- j. Publication of Survey Results. Action Complete
- k. NP News Letter. Action Complete
- l. Facebook Update. Action Complete
- m. Website Update. The website is currently all up to date with a caveat that the results of the most recent survey require a final piece of web development. Action essentially Complete

- n. Information to Consultant (PJ). PJ now has access to all the information held by the NPSG. As far as we can tell, the action is complete. Action Complete
- o. Covenants. Questions had been put to PJ on our ability to ensure that NP Policies continued into effect into the future. Could we enact covenants to restrict the use and size of housing (for example to preserve affordability or utility for the elderly or disabled)? Could we enforce preference for sale to locals? PJ had responded immediately before the meeting but there had been no time to even read the response. Action for future discussion.
- p. Sycamore Close Response. Action Complete

#### 4 **Review of all Recommendations: retain or remove.**

The Parish Council (SPC) had been asked to review the Recommendations put forward by the Working Groups but had directed that the SG should first review them.

There followed a long discussion on how we should “sentence” recommendations. On one hand, we have produced many more recommendations than any other known NP. On the other hand, all are the result of serious consideration by the Working Group volunteers and should not be dismissed lightly. In addition, the target and timescale of recommendations vary substantially: some are within SPC purview if monies become available; others would be a county responsibility or require circumstances unlikely to be met in the near or even medium term. Yet it would be wrong to lose sight of desirable aims because of current austerity for example.

##### **Decisions:**

1. All Recommendations should be preserved in an annex to the main Neighbourhood Plan.
2. The list of Recommendations should have a prior paragraph or paragraphs on the working groups, the basis for their recommendations and setting out clearly that Recommendations should be considered and reviewed throughout the life of the Plan.
3. Some key Recommendations, critical to the development of the village envisaged in the Plan, should be lifted into the body of the plan such as:

- a. Roads safety/traffic calming.
  - b. Improved public transport.
  - c. Restricting HGVs.
  - d. School catchment implementation.
  - e. Child-minding facilitation to ensure “affordable housing” can be afforded.
4. Decision on which, if any, recommendations should be lifted into the body of the Plan should be left until the Plan is in draft form and those Recommendations necessary and sufficient to support the Plan can be identified.

- 5 **66 High Street North Planning Application.** A revised submission to AVDC had been made by the developers ( <https://publicaccess.aylesburyvaldc.gov.uk/onlineapplications/> ).

Action: ND to circulate his email. Post meeting note: JW has circulated the email. Complete

It was clear that some of the changes ran directly counter to the thrust of the NP – for example including a 5 bed house. The Steering Group should provide an email to the SPC cross-referencing all the policies that the revised application contravened. ND had produced a response on exactly those lines. This should be circulated to all for comment.

6 **Any Other Business.**

1. Alignment and timeliness of Working Group Reports. The reports have been completed at different stages in a continually developing story.

**Decisions:**

- a. Policies in the final state agreed and published on the website should be cross-checked with the WG reports to ensure alignment.
- b. Once the draft plan is circulated, all will need to review in detail against Policies and Recommendations (mindful of Item 4 Decision 3 above).

Action: JE to lead the review.

Action: ALL

2. Consultant Budget. There is a need to ensure that the contract, budget, invoicing and finance are properly aligned despite the change in the key post of SPC clerk.

Action: JE to provide available supporting documentation.

7 **Date & Time of Next Meeting.**

Monday 15 January 2018 at 7.30pm at Red Barn Farm.