

28th June 2017

Minutes of the Meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Committee
held on **Tuesday 15 August 2017** at 10.30am
at Stantonbury Parish Office, 126 Kingsfold, Bradville

	15 minute session for members of the public to speak	Action
1/17	<p>Present: Cllr G Davison (Chairman) C Cllr R Wilde (RW) Cllr P Kirkham (PK)</p> <p>Lisa Emmanuel (LE) - Project Manager Kerry Fane (KF) - Administration Officer – Minute Taker Diane Webber (DW) – Milton Keynes Council</p>	
2/17	<p>Apologies for absence: Cllr S Agintas (SA) Cllr S Kennedy (SK) Cllr L Morgan (LM) Cllr G Parker (GP) Cllr D Wright (DW) Cllr D Outram (DO)</p> <p>Agreed by 3 votes for</p>	
3/17	<p>Elect a Chairman of the Committee Nominations were received for Cllr G Davison. It was resolved that Cllr G Davison be elected as the Chairman of the Neighbourhood Committee for 2017-2018 by 3 votes for.</p>	
4/17	<p>Receive the Chairman's Declaration of Acceptance Cllr G Davison signed the Declaration of Acceptance</p>	
5/17	<p>Declarations of interest None</p>	
6/17	<p>Chairman's Remarks: None</p>	
7/17	<p>Minutes: To approve and sign the Minutes of the Neighbourhood Plan Committee</p>	

Signed

Date

	Meeting held on 28 June 2017. Deferred until meeting on 23.08.17.	
	It was proposed that Item 9 – Milton Keynes Council – Diane Webber be brought forward to this point in the meeting. Proposed by Cllr R Wilde and Seconded by Cllr G Parker. See item 9 for full details.	
8/17	Reports: Update on Progress Cllr G Davison confirmed that the report was the same as was provided at the Main Council Meeting of 2 August 2017	
9/17	<p>Milton Keynes Council – Diane Webber How Milton Keynes Council can advise us on our Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>a) General comments regarding the process GAD-Policies – can anyone interested make changes to them after they are submitted to the examiner? DW-Changes can be made through consultations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is nothing to stop people from commenting at examination stage. However, the examiner just looks at the comments. • At MKC consultation stage any public comments are noted but the NP document need not change. • If contacted organisations or persons chose not to engage, as long as we show we have tried then this is enough. • Examiner hears all views and takes at their discretion. • Rarely the Examiner can convene a hearing to look into issues raised. <p>LE-All comments received, we publish are taken into account.</p> <p>b) Referendum DW-Timing - If start in January – at least 6 months. Go to referendum in November.</p> <p>c) Density Policy RW-Is it viable for a policy to put the number of houses in areas? DW-This is very difficult to do. Other Plans have had difficulties as unable to put hard and fast numbers into plan due to justifying evidence to support the policy. Specifying density is ok but it needs clarification of what density is. i.e does it include green space areas, grid road space. Specifics need to be stated.</p> <p>d) Change of Use RW-Can we put change use in plan? DW-If change of use yes, it's a valid land use. GAD-Amenity land – can it be outdoor gyms? DW- Would've thought so. If low key, locals can use. Don't think it's an issue.</p>	

Signed

Date

<p>e) Play Areas RW-Parish has a lot of play areas not part of asset transfer. SPC could spend lots upgrading certain areas-could there be clawback? DW-Difficult – ideally MKC will bring play areas up to standard until hand-over. LE-Formal open space designation-add already to plans as the areas are not changing. GAD-Does MKC have to release all play areas to SPC for policies to apply? DW-Don't need MKC to release for plan. Who has ownership is not a problem. It's been identified as important- Not an area want to lose.</p> <p>f) Trees GAD-SPC want to remove some trees that MKC don't. Can SPC put policy in place to remove? DW-sounds dangerous-could end up with no trees as all. RW-Nick CMK wont remove trees unless unsafe.</p> <p>g) Parking Bays GAD-If we chose to install parking bays and in doing so this may render a tree unstable can we ask for its removal?</p> <p>h) DW-Yes, can write in change. GAD-SPC has Parking bay issues generally. Can we ask for more parking bays? DW-Can't require MKC to make parking bays. Need to provide details and evidence. RW-We understand other factors are involved. DW-Where there is a need, it could happen.</p> <p>i) Land Grabbing GAD-Where does MKC stand on land grabbing?-trees that have been cut on council land. Can SPC have policy to have reinstated? DW-No. Can't put back what's not there. Amenity land-can have a policy-of "no fencing in". This would provide a legal instrument to enforce planning law in these situations. LE-How would MKC address-if land has been grabbed? GAD-Can we ask to move back? DW-No-Can't. Policy would stop any more but can't get to revert back.</p> <p>j) Green Spaces Stantonbury has large grass areas within the court areas, enough to place houses on-all have road access. Could that be designated as housing? LE-2 places identified-is it feasible that it could be built on. Should have discussion. Certain protection as amenities. GAD-given the aging population we don't have enough bungalows in the area. These could be placed in some of the court areas. DW-Need overall policy to protect/highlight one/two specifically for opportunity. Be specific-need to state why particularly important. DW-Can do small scale site allocations. Can specify type and tenure. –</p>	
---	--

Signed

Date

	<p>must have evidence-can't accept housing allocation restriction those in need-can't reserve areas/housing for locals only. RW-Can you allocate a time period after which housing could be assigned to locals? Can we give percentage of shared ownership? DW-If identified as a specific need. RW-Can we specify a certain no. of housing as passive? GAD-Yes we can specify minimum standards e.g. Code 6 housing. RW-Will every parking bay have to have an electric charging point? GAD-This could be justification for parking bays-putting bays in? DW-Will have to discuss with MKC. LE-What would go through is site specific areas. RW-Can you hold policies for specific needs (i.e. disabilities) DW-If no. of people have already been identified as having need GAD-Could be a need, but no evidence as can't give due to only being a possibility.</p> <p>k) Rowle Close-Parking Currently this is part of site allocation. To build where the garages are will exacerbate the parking problems further. Can SPC put policy in for an underground car park to accommodate new and existing parking needs. DW-Will have to double-check what off-site allocation plans say. LE-Naturally going to have problem if building on areas where garages existed. Whatever's built, could you then also have additional areas to provide parking? GAD-At the moment the whole area is problem in terms of parking. Could we use Section 106 money to pay for laybys, electric charging points? DW-N/Plan comes into its own-put things in place (infrastructures). List it all down, it shows you've thought about it. GAD-OK-We'll make a list. LE-The Community Centre could all come under.</p> <p>l) Protected Sites - Site-Specific Policy GAD-Parish has a lot of protected sites-could we put in the plan all the known areas and all those we may apply to English Heritage to list? DW-Yes. RW-Some areas are listed. DW-Where already listed it already has protection. Plan:MK will automatically have things in place. MKC-Have historic records through the Council's Archaeologist who would be aware of all protected areas. Our NO will be circulated to all MKC teams for consultation. LE-Are we able to do something similar (site-specific policy) for certain areas (i.e. vacated shops-Stantonbury). DW-Yes you can-encourage what you want to see. GAD-New potential Parish Office site LE-In principal</p>	<p>DW</p> <p>DW</p>
--	---	---------------------

Signed

Date

<p>m)</p> <p>n)</p> <p>o)</p>	<p>Cemetery Parking Cemetery Parking issues-traffic lights are a main issue-question-request for a crossing in the middle. DW-Will check out with Highways team</p> <p>Provision of Documents GAD-What does MKC need us to provide as we go along? DW-As and when information become available. When SPC feel close to finalisation/want clarification/help can act as advisor to help make better plan. GAD-So what about Archaeologist Emails other information we gather as evidence? DW-No, just end result of our work . GAD-What about evidence tried to get with no response. DW-Yes, need to keep evidence of attempts to get information. The examiner has option to call hearing to discuss more detail if necessary. Will need to provide a paper trail of what we have done.</p> <p>Windmill Land RW-Do we need to protect that parcel of land? DW-Has a degree of protection. RW-Council won't cut as woodland.</p> <p>DW left meeting at 12.09pm</p>	<p>DW</p>
<p>10/17</p>	<p>Policy Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robustness of our data 114 homes not included in data. These are classified as general MK. The street wide graphs, therefore, do not have these included. Very few streets have not responded to the survey. Defer until next meeting 23.08.17. • Policies and Pledges Defer until next meeting 23.08.17 	
<p>11/17</p>	<p>Timeline Update from Project Manager on where we are within the timeline. Defer until next meeting 23.08.17</p>	
<p>12/17</p>	<p>Date of Next Meeting To be agreed. It was agreed by council to hold the next meeting on Wednesday 23 August 2017 at 10.30 am.</p>	

The meeting finished at 12.24pm.

To confirm that the next meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Committee of Stantonbury Parish Council will be held on **Wednesday 23 August 2017 at 10.30 am** at the Parish Office, 126 Kingsfold, Bradville

Signed

Date

Signed

Date