



Minutes of Parish Council Meeting

Held on Tuesday 15th January 2019

Chairman: Councillor Mrs V Lynch
Councillors: Councillor Mr M Bird, Councillor Dr L Kennedy, and Councillor Mr N Rickard
Apologies: Councillor Mr D Clements, Councillor Mr A Coulson, Councillor Mrs M Lawrence and Councillor Dr H Price
Clerk Mrs R Biley
Attendance:
Parishioners: 5
By Invitation: Tim Northey- Rectory Homes

1. Apologies for absences

Apologies were received and accepted from Councillor Clements, Councillor Coulson, Councillor Lawrence and Councillor Price.

2. Disclosure of interest on items in agenda

Councillors had no interests to disclose for any agenda items.

3. Sign off of minutes

- Parish Council Meeting 2018 12 18

The minutes were approved and signed by the Chairman as an accurate account of the meeting held on the 18th December

4. Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Document Approval

Councillor Lynch introduced the item and confirmed that consultee responses to the consultation had been received circulated to all councillors. It was noted that five parishioner responses had been received and three responses from the statutory consultees. The next step would be to finalise the modification submission documentation and send this to AVDC, who will forward this on to the inspector for determination.

A parishioner asked whether the responses would be sent as received, to which the answer was yes, they would be forwarded as received. It was also asked how the amenity land would be managed. Tim Northey of Rectory Homes confirmed the amenity land would be managed by a management committee made up of residents from the new development. A further query was raised in relation to the trees with protection orders and it was advised that some of the trees were in a poor condition and would need management anyway, any further trees allocated for removal would be agreed by AVDC planners.

1254

Signed by
Chairman

Councillor Lynch asked councillors if they were content to now take the consultation to the next stage. This was approved by all councillors in attendance.

5. Planning

5.1. 18/04314/COUAR - Home Farm Manor Road Rowsham Buckinghamshire HP22 4QP

- Determination as to whether prior approval is required in respect of transport & highway impact, noise, contamination risk, flooding and locational considerations for the conversion of an agricultural building into one dwelling (Class Q(a))

Councillor Lynch introduced the item and advised this was a supplementary application in support of the one discussed by Council at a previous meeting. It was stated that the Council did not feel it could comment on whether prior approval was needed for such areas but that the Council had previously voted to register no objections to the earlier application.

The Clerk advised that she would submit comments advising this, if the Council agreed. The Council approved this by unanimous vote.

6. Finance

6.1. Approval of Chiltern Sports invoice - £29576.30 ex vat

6.2. Approval of Highlights Floodlighting invoice- £23835 ex vat

The Clerk advise that the payments were in respect of the work carried out at Wingrave Park and related to the new court. She also clarified that most of the costs would be claimed back from grants secured by Sport England and AVDC.

The Council approved the payments by unanimous vote.

Meeting ended at 19.50

1255

Signed by
Chairman

Summary of responses received from Parishioners with Parish Council comment where appropriate

No objection		N	Objection	O
--------------	--	---	-----------	---

No.	Date comment received	N / O / N
1.	Nov 18	N
	Happy to support the Parish Councils plan to change the Neighbourhood Plan	
2.	15 Nov 18	N
	I support the parish council's proposal.	
3.	15 Nov 18	N
	We have no objection to the proposed modification	
4.	17 Dec 17	O
	<p>The Leighton Road Development Working Group (Garry, Andy, Geoff) have detailed our response on the Leighton Road development (see below) as our input to the consultation process initiated by the Parish Council. A copy of the response has been sent to AVDC.</p> <p>Parish Council response: Having spoken to our Neighbourhood Planning consultant in this instance the consultation response can stand rather than ask each member to resubmit their comments individually. It clearly shows in the opening paragraph and at the end of the submission who the working group members are. This will be considered as a single response from 3 Leighton Road residents.</p> <p>It should be noted that working group is appointed to advise the Parish Council and should not be used as a vehicle for communicating their views to other parties. It should also be noted that this response was made</p>	

1256

Signed by
Chairman

No.	Date comment received	N / O
	<p>without the involvement of the Parish Council member for the working group. This Parish Councillor is of the view that in Working Group discussions with Bucks Highways and AVDC that the matters regarding Parking, Access and Open Space was effectively mandated by the Local Government authorities and removed from of the responsibility of the developer.</p> <p>In summary, the revised proposal does not adequately address the concerns raised by the Working Group. In several areas the proposal dilutes the original design intentions previously agreed with the developers. Furthermore, four specific areas have not been addressed to any satisfactory outcome:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leighton Road Parking 2. Access and traffic matters 3. Tree removal mitigation and maintenance of adequate views. 4. Handling of the open space <p>The developers have not addressed these requirements. The negotiation with the developers has not enabled the Parish to leverage its view in the design and has been too accommodating of the developer's wishes over the needs of the Parish.</p> <p>Parish Council response:</p> <p>1 – 3 Are not applicable to the modification area. These are planning issues and will be commented on as part of the Planning Application process.</p> <p>4 This has been agreed with the Developer. The land not used for housing will be designated as Amenity Land held in perpetuity for the benefit of Parish residents and this has been agreed in writing by the</p>	

1257

Signed by
Chairman

No.	Date comment received	N/ O
	<p>developer. The developer will set up a management company to manage and maintain the public open space in perpetuity.</p> <p>For the purpose of the modification area consultation the comments in respect of Points 1 – 3 above are not considered relevant and will not be taken into consideration. Point 4 : Open space is dealt with above.</p> <p>It is our proposal that the boundary clarification matter be used as an opportunity to engage constructively with the developers to address the above items and in so doing reach a sensible approach on the boundary changes to ensure a speedy resolution and progression of the development.</p> <p>The Working Group, on reaching a satisfactory resolution of the above key items, would then be willing to support any revised boundary amendments as part of a reasonable negotiation approach and, as a result, to support a conclusion to AVDC that the matter is not a material deviation from the original plan.</p> <p>The working group are offering their services to conduct this conversation with the developers and to agree discussion principles with the PC prior.</p>	N/ O
5.	20 Dec 18	O
	See attached response	
	<p>Parish Council response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The PC does not feel this modification changes the nature of the NP. After discussion with AVDC and the developers it was considered the inclusion of the additional 0.8Ha as green space and the development area contained within the 1.4HA provides a better solution. 2. A new planning application cannot correct historical issues. Additional visitor parking to be provided on land within the development area and is sited on land within the development which is at the boundary adjacent to Winslow Rd. 	

1258

Signed by
Chairman

No.	Date comment received	N / O
	3. This wording change was at the direction of AVDC 4. Written confirmation has been received from the Developer that the 0.8Ha amenity land held in perpetuity for the benefit of Parish residents. The developer will set up a management company to manage and maintain the public open space in perpetuity.	
6.		
7.		
8.		

1259

Signed by
Chairman



19th December 2018

To: Wingrave with Rowsham Parish Council
By email to Becky Biley

Dear Parish Councillors

Response to Consultation on the Modification to the Neighbourhood Plan

I was really pleased to see that the Parish Council have chosen to open the discussion about the proposed modification to the Neighbourhood Plan. Events at previous meetings had suggested that, as a Council, you were not interested in having a wider discussion on this topic. Indeed, that you wanted to close down discussion.

I think it isn't right to change the Neighbourhood Plan and I have set out my reasons in more detail in the attached note. But – if you want the short version – it is because:

- Your covering document suggests that extending the boundary of the Neighbourhood Plan does not change the nature of the Plan. But that is fundamentally wrong – details in the attached note.
- A number of the proposed changes to the Plan are proposed without previous discussion and with no explanation at all from the Parish Council in the covering document. Indeed, some of the policy changes are a complete reversal of the policies being changed (see point 3 of my note).
- The changes are proposed solely to facilitate the approval of a development that the Parish Council should never have approved in the first place – not simply because it was in breach of the Neighbourhood Plan but because it fails to achieve the stated aims (see point 2 and 4 of my note).

I was sorry to see this announced to the parish on postie being described as the correction of an error. That is not the case. The plan attached to the Neighbourhood Plan showed an area of about 1ha for this site whereas the document referred to 1.4ha. That was an error and enlarging the plan to 1.4ha would be correcting that error. This proposal however extends the size of the site to nearer 2.3ha. That is clearly not the correction of an error and so the announcement of these changes was misleading and, one can only assume, intended to deflect attention from what is change to the nature of our made plan.

The modifications contained in the modification proposal are so significant or substantial that they change the nature of the neighbourhood development plan which the modification proposal would modify.

Yours sincerely



Robert Wyatt

Attachment to the letter dated 19th December 2018 from Robert Wyatt objecting to the proposed modifications to the Wingrave with Rowsham Neighbourhood Plan

1. My primary objection is that, contrary to the statement issued by the Parish Council, the modification does change the nature of the Neighbourhood Plan. A fundamental principle of the Neighbourhood Plan is the red line boundary (the "Wingrave Settlement Boundary" / WSB) around the village which everyone agreed was to be essential to the plan. It was put in as Policy 1 as the very essence of the Plan. By extending the WSB to make way for this development the very nature of the Plan is being changed. Allocating new sites within the WSB, or swapping one site for another within the WSB, would probably not change the nature of the Neighbourhood Plan and be within the guidelines on the government website. But extending the WSB to accommodate new development does (a) change the nature of the Plan and (b)) the need to do so has not been sufficiently considered.
2. The Parish were very keen to see car parking provided within the proposed development for those residents of Leighton Road who currently park along the verge of Leighton Road. I note that Policy 4 of the modified Plan is to be amended to read as follows:

"(ix) On land adjoining the site and fronting Leighton Road the provision of a specific community benefit in the form of a private car park for the use of residents of Leighton Road."

However, the development proposed by Rectory Homes has no guaranteed parking within the development for these residents. Rectory Homes will provide a few non-allocated spaces in which these residents *could* park but, on a first come first served basis, it is unlikely they will be able to do so. The only solution is for these residents to continue to park on the highway verge. This is not the "provision of a... private car park", it is simply the residents continuing to park on the verge of the highway. This modification to the Plan is unnecessary and it would be better to reconsider the layout of the proposed development to meet this policy aim properly.

3. I notice that the wording of the Neighbourhood Plan policy 4 is to be changed:

From: *"(ii) the emphasis of open market and affordable dwelling types should be on providing larger detached homes;"*

To: *"(ii) the emphasis should not be on providing larger detached homes, but instead on the provision of open market and affordable dwelling types;"*

This seems to be a complete turnaround of policy. This policy within the Plan, as it stands, was intended to encourage the development of "larger detached homes" to be more in keeping with the existing houses along Leighton Road. The much lower density of this development (under the current Plan) was acceptable in order to achieve this aim. The modification of the Plan to expand the area to be developed, and to drop the density of the development would have suggested a greater emphasis on "larger detached homes" and so this change in the policy – which is not referred to in any of the supporting documents – and was not even discussed with the Working Group – is contradictory to the expansion of the proposed WSB. It changes the nature of the Plan by allowing housing at a far lower, and more wasteful, density than anything permitted by the Plan as it currently stands.