

## Neighbourhood Development Plan – Report 12<sup>th</sup> May 2014

1. A second meeting held with David Broadley, this time at AVDC. David Neave, Roger Dimmock and LWK attended from Wingrave with Rowsham. David Broadley produce minutes of the meeting. Copy appended, subsequent to the meeting a clarification note was sent to David Broadley which he accepted and added to the meeting record. Copy appended.
2. The withdrawal of the AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan and the notional need for a Neighbourhood Development Plan to be in conformity with a local District Plan has put the Parish Working Group (WG) in an awkward situation as both the PC and WG do not feel that we can wait for the possible two years for the new AVDC plan to be agreed. All participants have agreed that we should carry on and adopt the AVDC option 3 in their recent AYLESBURY VALE DISTRICT COUNCIL NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLANSGUIDANCE NOTE (March 2014), that is ‘Not to plan for a level of growth but focus on shaping development’. This third option is for NDPs not to define how many future homes, but instead to focus on how new development should be shaped. This could be through criteria based policies saying where development would be supported, by identifying what would be sustainable development for the neighbourhood area, for example the mix of dwellings and sizes, design and access (footpaths and cycle ways). The advantage of this is the NDP would not be trying to justify the level of growth, but how future development should be shaped and therefore housing numbers will not need to be debated as this will be addressed in the new AVDC Local Plan.
3. The NDP Working Group has initiated activities on NDP Policies to address the issue outlined in the paragraph above with a view to establishing whether they address the wishes of the Parish
4. Thanks to the efforts of Olwen Stovold we are now making further progress in establishing through the Land Registry, Parish Landowners and their address, so that the call for sites questionnaire can be distributed.
5. Identification and after Parish consultation and agreement of all parties of the Land development priorities is now an urgent priority. The owners of Thistlebrook Farms report that they have been approached by developers enquiring into their interest in exploiting their Parish land for development. Similar approaches have probably been made to other significant Landowners in the Parish. (Thistlebrook Farms report that they are only interested in Farming!) Pratts Charity has been approached by two development organisations expressing an interest in developing their land. Pratts Charity has agreed that if this results in any further engagement that they will keep the Parish Council fully informed. The Charity has no current plans for the development of its land in the Parish
6. The NDP WG efforts to obtain further Grant funding from the Luton Airport Community Support Scheme and the Buckinghamshire Community Foundation have been rejected.
7. Initial contact has been made with Sally Chapman the Wing Parish resident who is a “Planner” and part of the Wing NDP Working Group with in case it becomes appropriate to too seek her advice.
8. Robert Keith our nominated advisor at the Royal Town Planning Institute has been contacted to determine whether we can use his expertise in formulating policies. Subject to funding he has agreed.

## **Wingrave with Rowsham**

### **Neighbourhood Development Plan**

**Meeting Note 24/04/2014 – 2pm – The Gateway, Aylesbury Plan**

**For Wingrave with Rowsham PC - Dr Les Kennedy, David Neaves, Roger Dimmock**

**AVDC – David Broadley, Senior Planner (Forward Plans)**

#### **The Scope of the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP)**

- LK set out the NDP would need to include community engagement on the priorities for any pieces of land around Wingrave village. David Neaves will comment on what is needed for Rowsham, which would have its own plan.
- DB note post meeting - If a plan was just going to be produced with policies for Wingrave village only, this may mean reconsulting on the 'Neighbourhood Area boundary' confining it just to Wingrave. However if there could be useful policies also covering Rowsham then the Neighbourhood Area should stay as it is.
- The priorities for a NDP for Wingrave would be to provide guidance on what the community wishes to see on various sites around the village (not allocating the sites though and no housing target or settlement boundary) and also having policies on housing mix, density, bin storage and car parking and possibly infrastructure priorities e.g. sewerage treatment/wastewater networks.
- LK – There are lots of small businesses in the parish and Wingrave village and environs specifically including home working and on a business park. There is an appetite for expansion/ help to start up more businesses. DB – there can be policies in the new district plan on encouraging small businesses that the community can influence and also in a Neighbourhood Plan. AVDC's contact officer in our Economic Development section regarding small businesses is Mena Caldbeck [MCaldbeck@aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk](mailto:MCaldbeck@aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk)

#### **Community Engagement on Sites**

- DB outlined that the next stage on the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP) was evidence gathering on housing and economic needs/market assessment to inform the housing and economic development options for the plan and also housing and economic development capacity studies. Both of these would run to spring/summer 2015 (detailed timetables TBC). The housing and employment capacity study would look at the sites promoted to AVDC including from previous capacity studies (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and Employment Land Review). There are no studies showing promoted land at Rowsham just Wingrave.
- DB outlined there would be a steering group including town and parish representation on this capacity study, known as a Housing and Economic Development Land Availability Assessment (HELAA). LK outlined the PC would wish to have contact with the town parish council/community representation on the Steering Group. DB to provide details once Steering Group is created.

- LK/DN/RD asked when would communities be able to comment on site options for potential allocation in VALP? DB set out the HELAA was just to identify capacity but it would not do anything more than that – it would be one source feeding into options for site allocations and there are due to be three stages when communities can comment on options for where the growth would be distributed (settlements and sites) – the Options consultation and Draft Plan in 2015 and Pre Submission plan in 2016 (detailed timetable TBC). DB to email LK the Local Development Scheme (timetable for VALP)

### **Evidence to support the NDP**

- LK queried the evidence needed to support a policy on housing mix in a NDP. DB said the Great Horwood NDP evidence on housing mix/need was one option but it was consultant produced – see GHPC website <http://www.bucksvoice.net/greathorwoodpc/neighbourhood-plan/> ‘Housing Needs Survey’. The consultant was Community Impacts Bucks Jean Fox.

### **Funding**

- LK set out £3000 had been secured from Locality with the potential for a further £4000. DB said AVDC understands this funding pot is due to run out by March 2015 and could be earlier. So advised to not delay in securing any further Locality funding.

### **Rowsham**

- DN outlined there are 140 people and 44 homes in Rowsham. Rowsham would like to see further development as it has missed out on development which has taken place within the parish at Wingrave village. The key issues would be to find a site or several sites that could come forward for development whilst avoid increasing flood risk and not leading to coalescence with Bierton.
- DN asked whether Rowsham could do its own NDP as it is unlikely there would be growth identified there through VALP. DB said rather than a plan, a Neighbourhood Development Order or community Right to Build may be more appropriate. Both of these are site specific and you need to find a site in mind that can come forward (landowner intentions, who would develop it, what type of development is needed, to know the community would support it) before embarking on a formal application. DB to supply details on what Neighbourhood Development Orders (NDOs) and Community Right to Build (CRtB) applications are. One example of a NDP is already being prepared at Chilton parish council in the Vale. A couple of short guides DB found post-meeting:

<http://www.planninghelp.org.uk/planning-explained/neighbourhood-planning/neighbourhood-development-orders>

<http://www.planninghelp.org.uk/planning-explained/neighbourhood-planning/community-right-to-build-orders>

<http://www.rtpi.org.uk/planning-aid/neighbourhood-planning/> - particular enquiries can be put to Planning Aid to advise on

DB to attach to the meeting note a PDF by Locality on Community right to Build

- DN asked whether it is possible to have over time more than one Neighbourhood Development Order application at a settlement. DB confirmed yes this is possible and checked with colleague Charlotte Morris post meeting.

### **Consultancy to help**

- LK to enquire about the future availability of Sally Chapman who has been advising/producing on the Wing NP
- DB set out it is worth LK asking who Kevin Hewson has researched for the Quainton Neighbourhood Plan – he is on their parish council and is also looking for a consultant to produce a plan under his direction working to the needs of the parish council. Contact details kevin.hewson28@btinternet.com

### **Next Meeting**

- Thursday 26th June 2.30pm at the AVDC Gateway Offices in Aylesbury

### **Post Meeting Clarification Note**

Email from David Broadley 24 04 2014

Hi Les and all,

I will include all of the points below as an Annex to the note as requested.

Thank you

David

**From:** Les Kennedy [mailto:[les01@globalnet.co.uk](mailto:les01@globalnet.co.uk)]  
**Sent:** 08 May 2014 12:27  
**To:** Broadley, David  
**Cc:** David Neave; Roger Dimmock; Deborah Martin  
**Subject:** Fw: Draft note of meeting at AVDC 24.4.2014

David,

Please see David Neave's note below regarding your minutes of our meeting. David is making a number of important points and it is appropriate that they are included in the record of the meeting

Kind Regards Les Kennedy

**From:** [DAVID NEAVE](#)

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 07, 2014 5:43 PM

**To:** [les kennedy](#)

**Cc:** [Deborah Martin](#) ; [roger.dimmock50](#)

**Subject:** Draft note of meeting at AVDC 24.4.2014

1. In general, the draft note is accurate as far as it goes. But it sets out AVDC's position without adequately reflecting a number of the concerns which we voiced. It takes a top-down approach rather than an approach which recognises the key role which Parishes should have in Neighbourhood Planning.

## 2. Scope of the NDP

There is some misunderstanding over the position of Rowsham which is probably my fault. The point I was trying to make was that different issues apply to housing development in Rowsham than in Wingrave. That does not require a separate NDP for Rowsham, all that is needed is clear identification of the issues applying to each. Our Community Plan consultation showed a wish for additional housing in Rowsham and for more business units primarily because even modest growth would enable the provision of some basic amenities such as a children's playground and housing for young families. We believe that to deny that would be unreasonable. Our NDP needs to consider how to create a viable community in Rowsham . The NDO would not be the appropriate vehicle.

## 3. Community engagement on sites

We were surprised to learn that AVDC intended to undertake site allocation. The AVDC Neighbourhood Plan Guidance document sees site allocation as part of the NDP process. That makes good sense. Where and how Parish development occurs is very much a, and maybe the most, important issue for the local community. Taking it out of the hands of the local community simply invites resistance. There must therefore, at the least, be close, detailed and sensitive consultation with each Parish NDP Group. As we understood what is proposed, it will not be adequate. We made that view very clear at the meeting but the draft note does not reflect that. We believe our NDP Group should continue to identify land and landowners and to discuss possible sites as AVDC envisaged. Unless that happens much of the purpose of an NDP is lost.

4. Whilst I do not suggest the note be re-written I ask that this note be incorporated as an annexe to it.

David Neave