

Present 2015/0037	Cllr Simon Townsend, Cllr Diana Tanner, Cllr Natasha Thiebaut, Cllr Frank Spencer and Cllr Brian Drinkwater. Keith Lewis, R Gibbs, J Gibbs, Jane Allen, Shelley Bullivant, William Main (Manor Oak Homes), Mike Robinson (Strutt and Parker) Ashley Thompson, Frank Mahon, District Councillor John Chilver, Betty Picknell, Lynn Mazillius, Michael Mazillius and Chris Coombs. Details taken from circulated register – apologies for any omissions.
Apologies 0038	Cllr James Clarke, Cllr Paul Firth, Cllr Doreen Weingart and Cllr Joseph Hodges
Declaration of interest personal - prejudicial 0039	None present
To consider planning application 15/02671/AO P for erection of 95 dwellings to land east of Buckingham Road, Steeple Claydon	[Before this meeting there was an open meeting for Parishoners. At that meeting William Main had spoken on behalf of Manor Oak Homes and there had been a question and answer session] There was initial concern that there did not appear to be the posted yellow signs that would ordinarily accompany a development application. <i>Clerk would contact AVDC to see what was happening.</i> Cllr Spencer had spoken with at least 3 people who were for the development but not prepared to say out loud. There had only been about 30 people at the meeting and so was this representative. It was important that the PC response represented a balanced view especially as proposed North End development was in peoples minds as well. The whole village and infrastructure would be effected. Cllr Tanner was concerned regarding Neighbourhood Plan preparation and felt quite strongly a decision should not be made until that had been completed. Discussion re not wanting play area and looking for alternatives notwithstanding up to 20 community groups would want different things. An additional playground could cause a split in the community /village. A village ‘ feel ‘ needed to be retained.

Cllr Drinkwater thought main concern of the Parishioners was the road and additional traffic especially if Hs2 goes ahead. This proposed development could put tremendous pressure on what could be key exit from village. Overall couldn't whole heartedly agree it with so much other work going on indeed detrimental to our infrastructure.

Cllr Tanner very interested on the archaeological findings and what this may uncover.

Cllr Townsend thought the Parish Council needed to be consistent and judge the proposal on its own merits. This development is bigger than Gladman proposed development and as such has implications on all aspects of the village and facilities and infrastructure and has to go into a response. Also considers reference to Neighbourhood Plan in our response to AVDC which should include how such a development should look. Travel Plan – obviously money going into buses etc but you always hit a single track bridge whichever way you go out of village. Pressure on infrastructure from construction traffic and is this limited. Increased car ownerships also will effect.

Effect on schooling also relevant. Cllr Townsend's proposal was that the Parish Council would object to the outline planning application on the grounds to be included 1. Implication on facilities and infrastructure 2. Neighbourhood plan 3. Increase in traffic , dependent on cars. Proposed Simon Townsend, seconded Natasha Thiebaut. – all agreed.

Cllr Townsend continued re affordable housing and should ask if housing could be allocated to local people – we are a remote community and there is identified demand.

Key worker housing was considered for towns elsewhere – it was considered from feedback that couples with two or more children was where the demand was. Discussed proposed percentage split rent and shared ownership. Response would reflect specific housing needs. No bungalows

proposed. Discussed school capacity and catchment; comments both positive and negative re application. Cllr Townsend asked was everyone aware an outline planning application only, there was a concern this may not be understood and that it could change in layout. General discussion on this. Further discussion on housing mix on application. Reference made to planning boards where full details of development by bed numbers identified 4x 4 beds, 8x3 beds, 6 x 1beds and 11 x 2 beds (affordable housing) – Cllr Drinkwater questioned mix of affordable housing which did not necessarily mirror the needs of the village. *Cllr Townsend suggested that the outline of the document covered all of the main topics and the decision that is made tonight but only grammatical amendment be made before the detail. This was agreed by all.*

Further discussion re infrastructure and restriction on length of SCPC response to AVDC. Discussion re drainage and avoidance of water into road as per presentation. General discussion regarding sewage but agreed that if the experts said there was capacity why should we question this.

Cllr Tanner concerned about possible light pollution and were there any biodiversity reports? Facilities and potential discussed and was another playground really needed and would PC have to maintain it. Perhaps different provision which would be identified in the neighbourhood plan. Cllr Townsend suggested that further advice be taken with regard to possible 'wants' are for the village and to whether this is included in the response now being prepared. Proposed Cllr Townsend, seconded Cllr Spencer. All agreed.

Discussion re traffic calming, Cllr Spencer said this is not something for this discussion however if this development goes ahead we would need to look at traffic measures on the Buckingham Road. More pressure on co-op corner and would there be scope for a shop in the proposed development. Extended discussion re co-op corner discussions and cumulative impact of developments.

	<p>Discussion with regard possible restricted vision when trees in full leaf. Discussion re public footpaths and rights of way.</p> <p>Cllr Townsend summarised what would go into report drawn from information above. It was generally agreed that the summary was a true reflection of what they had been told.</p> <p>S106 clarification again mentioned a to whether we could ask for 'wants' even if application declined. Concerns with regard to reconvening and timing of response but not a rushed response because no signage posted. Cllr Townsend was of the opinion there were a number of ongoing projects which are part of an ongoing neighbourhood plan. Impact of these potential houses would almost certainly require investment in social and recreational facilities. Councillors all agreed summary.</p> <p>The meeting was closed by the Chair at 10pm.</p>
--	--