

STEWKLEY PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF A

STEERING GROUP MEETING

MONDAY 20th AUGUST 2018 AT RED BARN FARM

Present:

Neil Dickens (ND) - Chairman
Keith Higgins (KH) - PC Chair
Gill Morgan (GM) - PC Vice Chair
Margaret Burgess (MB) - PC Councillor
Paul Smith (PS) - PC Councillor
Jenny Wodey (JW) - PC Councillor
Steve Nicholl (SN)

ITEM

ACTION/DECISION

- 1 **Apologies for Absence:**
Apologies had been received from Janette Eustace (JE).
Andrew Pryke (AP) and Laraine Chappell (LC) were unable to attend.

- 2 **Minutes of meetings: 16 July and 23 July 2018.**
The minutes of both meetings were accepted unanimously as a true reflection of the relevant meetings.

Action: SN to forward the minutes to the Parish Clerk for insertion in the parish website.

3 Matters Arising [Item numbers refer to Minutes of 16 July meeting].

- (a) Item 2: Minutes to Parish Clerk. Action Completed
- (b) Item 3(b): Boundary Line. Action Completed (see particularly Minutes of meeting 23 July 2018).
- (c) Item 3(c): Seek AVDC views on policies. The policies had been sent to AVDC. Their comments had been received and circulated and would be discussed under Item 6 below. The role of Paul Jobson would be considered in the light of the work required to consider our draft policies and AVDC views.
- (d) Item 3(d): House sizes. Action Completed
- (e) Item 3(g): Mapping 'views'. Action Completed
- (f) Item 3(i) Housing baseline numbers - VALP figures. Action Completed
It is not clear from the elements of the VALP and predecessor versions what baseline house numbers have been used for the parish. However, we can compute the baseline from, for example, numbers of houses to be built given both as numbers of houses and a percentage of the baseline.
- (g) Item 3(m) Funding for the plan. More funding is now available and we have been told that, despite our allocation having been made under the old cap, we can make a case for more if needed. Action Completed

4 Progress - 66 High Street North development.

There has been no specific reported progress. Equally, there was nothing to indicate that the success in reducing the number/size of larger houses in the development was under threat. There appears to be something of a hold-up over surface water drainage.

5 Progress - Soulbury Road development.

There was no further news on potential selection of developers. However, minor work, for example soil testing and access, appears to be ongoing.

- 6 **AVDC Comments on revised proposed policies.**
AVDC comments had been circulated and had aroused initial disappointment. However, a subsequent email from AVDC had said that there were relatively few comments for a first draft NP arriving at AVDC. Comments ranged from relatively simple word changes to match planning usage, via documentation and authorities to be included to comments requiring that we do further work. This work included provision of more/clearer evidence and liaison with (County/District) Highways, Heritage and Conservation as well as Planning. In discussion, it was agreed that this liaison should, at least initially, be by phone or face to face rather than email.

Actions:

- a. ND to categorise AVDC comments as: word change; documentation; actions for Stewkley.
- b. KH to liaise with Highways.
- c. ND to establish contacts in Heritage, conservation and Planning.
- d. AP to explain and justify “Stewkley Code for Sustainable Homes”

7 **Current revised Plan.**

General feedback within the Steering group was that the current draft was much improved. Nevertheless, there was robust discussion on how we might improve it, both to meet the AVDC criticisms and to better explain the logic underlying site selection and housing numbers. Whilst, in reality, judgements made in initially assessing possible sites came before specific formulation of policies such as the Settlement Boundary, there are consistent values and priorities that underlie the process. One value not included in our justification was that of preserving a sense of *community*. That could be lost if all new housing was aimed at increased numbers in the village and long established residents were forced to leave because they could not stay and down-size. A possible logic, setting out the hidden “policies” under-pinning the assessment process was aired and seemed worth exploring further. In the meantime, those who had further comments on Draft 2 should pass them to the Chairman.

Actions:

- a. SN to provide a skeleton structure leading from the “hidden” values to detailed housing policies.
- b. ALL to provide any further comments on Draft 2 to ND as soon as practical.

8 Any Other Business.

(a) Discussion with Paul Jobson. It was agreed that the review and response to AVDC comments would have to be completed before there could be decision on the future role of Jobson's role.

(b) It is some considerable time since an update was inserted in the Grapevine. It was agreed that an entry, based on the AVDC email, should make the points that they had relatively few adverse comments. Nevertheless, they had shown that there was much work to do to make our Plan sufficiently robust to survive examination and challenge.

(c) It was reported that a new 10 ft wide cycle (and foot) path from Waddesdon to Aylesbury had been observed. This runs across country (Secretary's note: in part, following the old Roman Akeman Street). It is possible that routes across country to Wing and the Grand Union Canal (in the vicinity of Stoke Hammond or Three Locks) would be easier to achieve than adding cycle lanes to existing roads.

9 Date and Place of Next Meeting.

Details of the next meeting will necessarily await progress on the work to be done under Items 6 and 7 above.

Actions:

a. ND to write a submission to the Grapevine.

b. KH to investigate the potential for such routes.

SM Nicholl
22 Aug 2018