

**STEWKLEY PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF A**

**STEERING GROUP MEETING**

**MONDAY 15 JANUARY 2018 AT RED BARN FARM**

**Present:**

Neil Dickens (ND) - Chairman  
Jenny Wodey (JW) - PC Chair  
Gill Morgan (GM) - PC Councillor  
Andrew Pryke (AP) - PC Councillor  
Paul Smith (PS) - PC Councillor  
Lorraine Chappell (LC)  
Janette Eustace (JE)  
Emma Galvin (EG)  
Steve Nicholl (SN)

<b>ITEM</b>		<b>ACTION/DECISION</b>
1	<b><u>Apologies for Absence:</u></b> Margaret Burgess.	
2	<b><u>Minutes of meeting on 11 December 2017.</u></b> The minutes were accepted unanimously as a true reflection of the meeting.	

<p><b>3</b></p>	<p><b><u>Matters Arising &amp; Actions to be taken.</u></b></p> <p>a. <u>HELP Report.</u> All that needs to be done to date has been completed. In due course, either following further inputs from Paul Jobson or AVDC or following receipt of the Draft Plan, there will need to link together the two current ‘halves’. The “front end” covering call for potential sites from landowners and the rejection of some sites, drafted by GM, needs to be married up to the final selection of the 13 sites proposed.</p> <p>b. <u>AVDC consultation on Sites &amp; Boundary.</u> A meeting had been held with representatives of AVDC planning. Unusually, Stewkley is offering more sites than required to meet AVDC’s minimum requirement (met by currently approved in-fill, 66 High Street North and Soulbury Road). AVDC’s principle concerns were over ensuring clear edges to the village; that the proposed Bowls Farm site does not extend too far back from the road (it does not) and that design and landscaping of the Bletchley Road and Wing Road ‘entrances’ define the edge of the village in a sympathetic way. They were very supportive of the proposed Secondary Boundary, which is good for the village in the long term (and supports the decision to propose all 13 sites!).</p> <p>c. <u>Circulation of Minutes of the meeting with Denison.</u> The minutes have been recirculated so that those who could not download the previous format now have access.</p> <p>d. <u>Policies.</u> Three further policies have been proposed and, once reviewed, need to go on the website. A further policy has been proposed, to give the PC first call on S106 funds for play equipment/leisure enhancements for general benefit in the Recreation Ground, rather than small packets within individual developments.</p>	<p>No Further Action currently</p> <p>No Further Action pending any more formal input from AVDC.</p> <p>Action Complete</p> <p>Action in hand.</p>
-----------------	--	--

<p>4</p>	<p><b><u>66 High Street North Planning Application.</u></b>  Details of the application to date are available at <a href="https://publicaccess.aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk/online-applications/">https://publicaccess.aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk/online-applications/</a> . This showed one 5-bedroom house and more 4 and 3-bedroom houses than called for in emerging plan. However, in a meeting with the developers, they agreed to make the 5-bed house a 4-bedroom one and to make 2 of the 3-bedroom houses into (more affordable) 2-bedroom places. This is a significant success. However, there are still issues on parking - specifically to help ease parking on the High Street itself - and surface water run-off. Whilst there are ditches behind the site, they have not been maintained for many years and a site specific policy on clearing the ditches is required.</p>	<p><u>Action:</u> lies with PC; the deadline has been extended to end of January.</p>
<p>5</p>	<p><b><u>Progress of SEA.</u></b> JE, with a small Working Group, had reduced the very wide range of potential scoping questions to a very manageable 5 questions. These had been circulated to statutory consultees. Their responses have been circulated to PC members but do not undermine the proposed 5 question process: AVDC made a few comments mostly reserving their position until they have seen the actual assessments of each site: Historic England made a very detailed response mostly relating to the wider plan and policies; the Environmental Agency essentially provided an out-of-date cut and paste of previous comments.  The next steps will be for Paul Zanna to do the assessments; his assessments will then be reviewed by JE and her Working Group, enhanced by AP (as chair of HELP WG).</p>	<p><u>Action:</u> JE, with AP and others, to review SEA assessments when compiled by Paul Zanna.</p>
<p>6</p>	<p><b><u>Progress with consultant Paul Jobson (PJ).</u></b>  The first draft of the whole Neighbourhood Plan had been delayed by PJ's paternity leave. However, he now planned to pass the draft to the group within a few days. The Steering Group (and PC) would need to review the draft carefully, looking for internal contradictions, gaps and unintended consequences, before revision of the document.</p>	

7	<p><b><u>Process by which draft NP will be considered.</u></b>  Group members would individually need time to study the draft in detail as above. However, the work must not be allowed to slide. It was agreed that individuals group members should have 3 weeks to read and comment, that comment collators should have one week to collate/ summarise comments and that the Steering Group should meet subsequently to resolve or sentence the comments.</p>	<p><b><u>Actions:</u></b>  ALL - to read the first draft sceptically and comment within 3 weeks.  Within 1 further week: GM - to collate comments from PC Councillors.  JE - to collate comments from non-PC (!) SG members.</p>
8	<p><b><u>Keeping Parish residents aware of progress.</u></b>  It was important to provide an update after the Christmas/New Year gap. Moreover, the new potential timelines for detail planning application work on the Soulbury Road site and the development of the village NP provide the basis for an important message. Unfortunately, the formal deadline for the next edition of the Grapevine had just passed. However, if produced quickly, a news item might just be accepted. That item should form the basis of social media updates.</p>	<p><b><u>Actions:</u></b>  SN - to draft an update article for the Grapevine and forward it to EG.  (Complete).  EG - to put similar messages on social media.</p>
9	<p><b><u>Any Other Business.</u></b>  There was no other business.</p>	
10	<p><b><u>Date &amp; Time of Next Meeting.</u></b>  As set out at Item 7 above, timing of the next SG meeting depends on the timing of circulation of the first draft Plan. The meeting will take place at Vicarage Farm at a date and time to be circulated.</p> <p>SM Nicholl 17 Jan 2018</p>	