

MINUTES of a MEETING of the **DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE** of WINSLOW TOWN COUNCIL held on **WEDNESDAY 23rd April 2014**, at 7pm in the Council Chamber at 28 High Street, Winslow.

	Present: Cllrs. Cawte (Chairman), Knight, Laws, Van de Poll and Wiseman. Apologies: None Deputy Clerk: K Oddey Clerk: C Loch There were no members of the public or press present during the meeting.		
	Declarations of Interest: none Consideration of Applications for Dispensation – none		
D14/41	Minutes of Meeting held on Wednesday 26 th March 2014: RESOLVED that the minutes be signed as a true record. Matters Arising: None		
	Items delegated by Council: None		
	Items deferred from previous meeting: None		
	Applications Received:		
	Reference	Location	Description
D14/42	14/00787/ATP	5 Bevan Court	Crown thinning by 30% of one Ash tree.(FYI ONLY)
	Noted that this application had been determined at the previous Council meeting as RESOLVED no objection		
	14/00702/APP	Land off Verney Road	Phase 3. Erection of 59 dwellings with associated parking, garages and amenity spaces. (due 25.4.14)
D14/43	RESOLVED to object on the grounds that the mix did not include sufficient smaller properties, there should be a higher proportion of rented affordable homes and they should be better distributed within the development, the flats were not consistent with the existing street scene, and there were issues with matters such as parking, cycle storage, security, badger protection and the archaeological survey. A detailed letter would be drafted to respond to Development Control and would be attached to these minutes. The Deputy Clerk was asked to request a meeting with the case officer.		
D14/44	14/00840/ATP	4 Bevan Court	Remove deadwood & reduce spread of 1 Weeping Ash tree. (due 28.4.14)
	RESOLVED no objection.		
D14/45	Appeals 13/02174/AOP	Land to East of Winslow	Gladman Development (East of Little Horwood Rd) – 100 residential units, associated infrastructure and access.
	Members noted that a response had been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 22 nd April 2014		
D14/46	Permitted 13/03436/APP	11 Parsons Close	Single storey side/rear extension & 2 storey side extn
D14/47	Winslow Neighbourhood Plan No material progress. Meeting held 22.4.14 with AVDC to ensure no issues with agenda for 1 st May 14 Public Examination. If examiners report received mid May it may be possible to have a referendum before the July school holidays.		
D14/48	Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP) It was agreed that members would come prepared to discuss feedback at the next meeting and agree a response. Response required by 28th May 14		

D14/49	<p>LAF: The following topics were identified as proposed agenda topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How do AVDC handle disposal of large items of waste - Are there any plans to increase capacity of Buckingham Recycling Facility - What are the statistics for recycling <p>In addition, a possible topic “what is available funding for accessible footpaths” was discussed. The Committee would seek input from organisations such as The Big Society and Ramblers to better understand what was required. Cllr Cawte would obtain answers to previous bus service questions from Cllr Payne</p>
	<p>Consultations – none</p>
D14/50 D14/51	<p>Highway Matters</p> <p>Zebra Crossing: The Deputy Clerk and Councillors would meet with TfB on 29th April 2014 to discuss options</p> <p>Weight Restriction Horn St: Members considered key issues to be considered including the alternative route and associated problems, police enforcement, cost of implementation and the cost and proliferation of signs. It was noted that speed was the major cause of noise and vibration. BCC Cllr. J Chilvers would be asked to establish with TfB just what BCC was prepared to do before the matter was progressed further.</p>
D14/52	<p>Correspondence: Not dealt with elsewhere on the agenda.</p> <p>23 Station Road, response to correspondence (13/03448/APP) Committee RESOLVED to send letter to applicant cc. AVDC. Key points: (a) if asked, we’d have agreed to meet – note constructive meeting held on previous applications with open invite for future meetings. (b) is it possible to have copy of the letter (c) Application over Christmas holidays and no yellow notice received compounded lack of time to respond. (d) we have provided transcript of what was said – no inference of “roughshod”. Note: District Councillor is aware that WTC Development Committee had previously talked to Applicant but hadn’t c.f. this specific application. Dep Clerk to draft letter and circulate for feedback</p> <p>Parish Council Review of Delegated Powers – noted</p>
	<p>Reports from Outside Bodies:</p> <p>Winslow & District Local Area Forum. See LAF above</p> <p>Winslow District Community Bus: New step doing well.</p> <p>Local Councils Planning and Liaison Group (AVDC): Recent retirement of John Burn has raised questions around management and planning. Day to day activities covered (Susan Kitchen). Forward planning addressed (Andy Kirkham). Awaiting date for next meeting</p> <p>North Bucks Parishes Planning Consortium: Next meeting 18th June 2014</p>
D14/53	<p>Items for Information:</p> <p>Statistics – Members asked if any information from the last Census was available to support activities. Deputy Clerk would investigate what was available.</p> <p>Meeting Date Suggestions – possible approach of 1 meeting per month (standard day/week) plus one other option/as require meeting 2 weeks afterwards favourably discussed. Options 1st (and 3rd) Wednesday or 2nd (and 4th Wednesday). For discussion at ACM</p>
	<p>Meeting closed 8.20 pm</p> <p>The date of the next meeting 14th May 2014.</p> <p>Signed: (Chairman) at Meeting 14th May 2014</p>

EXHIBIT 1.**PLANNING APPLICATION RESPONSE****FROM WINSLOW TOWN COUNCIL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

Reference	Location	Description
Applications Received	Winslow, BUCKS.	
14/00702/APP	Land off Verney Road	Phase 3. Erection of 59 dwellings with associated parking, garages and amenity spaces. (due 25.4.14)

The Town Council Development Committee **OPPOSES the application** – for reasons given below:

1. Number of properties:
 - a. See point 3.5 of Planning Statement. Outline planning permission was granted for entire 3 phase site to Banner Homes in Feb 2008 for 220 homes. Subsequently detailed approval for Phase 1 (The Glade) – 116 homes and Phase 2 – 27 homes, which is the development currently under way. This Phase 3 application is for 59 homes which means the entire site would only provide 202 homes, not the 220 Winslow has assumed within the Winslow Neighbourhood Plan. Is this application aiming for too few homes?
2. Mix of properties:
 - a. The Design and Access Statement confirms in Section 4.1 that this application for 59 homes would provide 28 X 4 bedroom market (private) homes, 13 X 3 bedroom market homes and 18 assorted 1, 2 and 3 bed affordable homes. With nearly 50% of all the homes planned being 4 bedroom dwellings. This does not provide for a suitable mix of homes.
 - b. There would be no 2 bedrooms for the general private market, contrary to what has been recognised as needed in Winslow and the District. This means the development will not provide sufficient smaller, low cost market housing (see Section 1.4 h of Design and Access Statement). The G L Hearn housing study commissioned by AVDC for the Vale of Aylesbury Plan, confirmed that the future need was for significantly more 2 bedroom homes as there is a serious shortage of such dwellings in the Vale. The study confirmed that over many years the delivery of new homes has not reflected the real need for new, smaller homes, thereby exacerbating the shortage of such dwellings in the District.
 - c. Section 4.1 confirms that the affordable homes proposed would be for rent: 4 X 3 bedroom, 5 X 2 bedroom, and 3 X 1 bedroom and for part ownership: 6 X 2 bed room. This is only 30% as affordable housing, rather than the 35% more typically seen in recent developments.
3. Distribution of different house sizes.
 - a. The affordable homes are not distributed throughout the site, note the 2 bedroom properties clustered at either end.
4. Consistent look and feel with phase 1 and 2 properties, particular points noted:
 - a. The apartment block does not appear to have a pitched roof. It would seem reasonable for the apartment block to have a similar design to that of the other blocks.
 - b. Similarly, the French windows in previous development apartment, blocks does not appear to be replicated here, being replaced by standard windows.
 - c. The bricked out windows do not appear similar to previous developments either, should they be removed or replaced by windows?
 - d. In general, the Windows in plots 7 to 12 are not in keeping with the rest of the developments, nor indeed Winslow.
 - e. Similarly the windows in Plots 2, 18 and 30 appear to very small.
 - f. In general, the committee believe the different developments phases should have similar designs.
5. Kerbside Parking:

- a. There does not appear to be any provision for kerbside parking within the officially designated parking areas. The width of many of the roads prevents kerbside parking from being safe or practical.
 - b. In the Traffic Impacts section of the Traffic Assessment, for 1 or 2 bed dwellings it indicates one visitor space for two such dwellings referring to nearby communal parking. Looking at the plans, there does not appear to be any communal parking allocated and the apartments all have just one allocated parking space.
6. Security:
- a. There appears to be a blind spot around plots 7-12 created by the blanked out windows. This could encourage delinquency and would inhibit neighbour security.
7. Badger protection:
- a. An earlier survey had a badger latrine/feeding run along the southern hedge. There is no mention of this in the ecological survey with the application? What is the situation with Badgers at or near the site and have appropriate measures been put in place?
8. Archaeological Survey
- a. There doesn't appear to be a survey. Is it expected that this will be done? It is noted that while nothing was found in an earlier survey this development does involve Knoll Hill and the Mill there has not been found yet.
9. Cycle parking:
- a. In 3.2 of the Design and Access Statement, it states "Cycle parking will be available for 100% of the dwellings" and in the Transport Statement there is an assurance of secure cycle parking in garages or sheds. For the apartments in particular, such sheds are neither shown nor, because of lack of space around the building, does not appear practical. How will this be delivered?

The Town Council Development Committee would appreciate the opportunity to discuss this application with the case officer and to talk about options to address their concerns. Please can you confirm if this is possible and how best to arrange a mutually convenient time.

The Council DOES wish to speak at committee please.