

Minutes of an **Interim Council Meeting** of Buckingham Town Council held at 7pm.  
on **Monday 28<sup>th</sup> October 2013** in the Council Chamber, Cornwalls Meadow, Buckingham.

Present:	Cllr. T. Bloomfield	
	Cllr. H. Cadd	
	Cllr. P. Collins	
	Cllr. P. Hirons	
	Cllr. A. Mahi	
	Cllr. H. Mordue	
	Cllr. L. O'Donoghue	(Deputy Mayor)
	Cllr. Mrs. C. Strain-Clark	
	Cllr. R. Stuchbury	
	Cllr. W. Whyte	
Guests	Mr. John Horsman	Montpellier Estates
	Ms. Jaime Powell	Sainsbury's
	Mr. William Wood	GKA, consultants to Sainsbury's

For the Town Clerk: Mrs. K. McElligott

*In the absence of the Mayor, the Chair was taken by the Deputy Mayor.*

#### **470/13 Apologies**

Apologies were received and accepted from Cllrs. Ms. R. Newell (Mayor), Mrs. G. Collins, J. Harvey, D. Isham, R. Lehmann and M. Smith.

#### **471/13 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

#### **472/13 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> September 2013 and ratified at Full Council on 30<sup>th</sup> September 2013 were received and accepted.

*Proposed by Cllr. Bloomfield, seconded by Cllr. Mahi, and **AGREED** to suspend Standing Orders in order to allow the guests to speak.*

#### **473/13 Lace Hill Health Centre Site**

Mr. Wood introduced his colleagues and said that they had asked to address the Council to update it on progress with the Health Centre site, part of the Sainsbury's application for the employment area at Lace Hill (13/01465/AOP).

Since the discussions had been initiated, the NHS had been reorganised and there were different entities to deal with. He was not able to give real detail at this time, but the Montpellier would develop the health centre for use by NHS services. There had been strong interest both from primary services (doctors, dentists) and secondary services (hospitals and treatment centres). There were separate commissioning structures for each level.

The aim was to cut down the necessity for residents to travel to Milton Keynes, Stoke Mandeville, Oxford or High Wycombe, simultaneously freeing time and resources at those hospitals. A GP practice or dentist would have facilities available in the same building to carry out further treatment or refer to a visiting consultant. Secondary level facilities could include renal dialysis, X-ray and other imaging, physio- and other therapies. Other provision could include an ambulance base, conference and teaching rooms to be used in conjunction with the University's

medical school. Various Hospital Trusts has expressed an interest, and when the facilities to be provided had been agreed detailed planning of bespoke accommodation would begin.

He noted that the initial survey had asked separate questions about the store and the health centre, and the store had received the stronger support.

Councillors asked questions:

Had the AV Commissioning Group been approached? (JH): Buckingham residents can go to any supplier. AVCCG pays for the service.

Some services parallel those at Buckingham Hospital; conflict might lead to closure and the loss of its 16 beds. (JH): The Health Centre will not compete with Buckingham Hospital at all, this is not the intention. The aim is to save patients travelling long distances for services. The improvements to the NHS mean that many problems can be dealt with on the spot.

The s106 condition attached to the permission for the housing site was to provide a fully serviced 1ha site for a healthcare facility; this is a commercial proposition, nothing to do with the developers' contribution. Fine, if this is what Sainsbury's want to do, but no evidence has been produced as to the proposed facilities being what the town needs – what consultations have taken place? (JH/WW): The need for additional provision was identified to serve the increased population. Discussions have taken place since to ascertain the requirements.

Concern was expressed by several Members about the additional traffic numbers on the roundabouts, taking into consideration the expansion of Tesco and the additional vehicle movements associated with another supermarket and petrol station as opposed to the B1/B8 use originally proposed for the employment site. The s278 works proposed for the bypass roundabout and feeder roads would cause months of disruption – which would affect the town centre businesses and access to schools – and to find that these changes could not cope adequately with supermarket traffic would mean further modifications and more disruption. It was noted that the survey had included surrounding villages, many with few shopping facilities, but the effect would mainly be felt by the people and businesses of Buckingham. (WW): The Transport Assessment carried out indicated that there would be sufficient capacity.

Members also felt that the health centre and supermarket & petrol station should not have been on the same application, and also criticised the unexceptional design of the health centre, more suited to an office building. A lot of research said that good health outcomes were linked to good architecture. The health centre was linked to the housing site, not the employment site, and planning permission had not yet been granted to the store – what would happen to the health centre if it was not? Would it go ahead separately? (JP): This is common on a mixed-use Outline Permission: details could be provided on the store, but the health centre would remain an outline only until requirements were known. Then a new application would be made. (WW): With the strong interest already expressed, the NHS commissioning process should follow.

Nevertheless nothing was concrete until planning approval was obtained; there needed to be discussion on the effect on Buckingham Hospital, which had a perfectly good X-ray unit and physiotherapy clinic already, and an explanation of the plans to the general public, many of whom already assumed that Sainsbury's had permission to go ahead. (JH): There will be a public presentation eventually.

It was disingenuous to say that the health centre was not linked to the Sainsbury's; Sainsbury's own publicity linked them though there was no reason for them to be linked. If the application, or Montpellier's recruitment of tenants, failed what safeguards were in place for the s106 monies to be used for the benefit of

Buckingham healthcare? (WW): The buildings are linked because Sainsbury's are facilitating the health centre; if there is no interest the building can revert to B1 use; however given the strength of interest, it was likely that the B1 element would be withdrawn.

Members had been circulated with the response to the planning application from the Friends of the hospital and the AV CCG, and it outlined the present extensive services available, and advocated that a renal dialysis unit would be best situated at the hospital should it be agreed that one was needed in Buckingham. (JH): The original s106 simply looked at providing a GP surgery; we propose to take this further but it is a complex and lengthy process and will take some time to integrate. The land was not provided free of charge, Montpellier would have to pay for it. It was pointed out that the s106 was for provision of a serviced site; it could be provided elsewhere, and that the land value was created by the health centre use. Comment was made that this was a fishing expedition to test the Town Council's reaction, and that a request for a presentation opportunity could well have been left until more information and detail was available.

The design and size was determined by Sainsbury's, not by BTC or AVDC; a smaller building could have been proposed with more likelihood of adoption by the NHS. (WW): A separate consultation is part of the NHS process.

Members remained concerned that if the building was used for offices that the s106 money would be lost to the town; they also felt that competition for duplicated services was pointless, and the centre should provide complementary services. (JP): If the B1 use was a problem, it could be withdrawn next day. She was asked to do that.

*Cllr. Mordue left the meeting.*

The Deputy Mayor, summing up, commented that so often local input was sought and then ignored, which was frustrating. She thanked the visitors for attending.

*The guests then left the meeting.*

*Proposed by Cllr. Bloomfield, seconded by Cllr. Mahi, and **AGREED** to reinstate Standing Orders.*

#### **474/13 County Council Budget Consultation**

Concern was expressed that there was insufficient information on the impact of the different budget options for respondents to make a sensible decision. A tick-box exercise was not the way to make such decisions, although it had been done the previous year. The Deputy Mayor said that it took a very short time – it had taken her about 10 minutes earlier in the evening. Members agreed to make individual response, and to consider a Town Council response at Full Council (Council response date 2<sup>nd</sup> December).

**ACTION: FULL COUNCIL AGENDA**

#### **475/13 Draft Housing and Homelessness Strategy 2014-2017**

Members asked for a summary of the consultation document to be brought to Full Council for consideration and response.

**ACTION TOWN CLERK/FULL COUNCIL AGENDA**

**476/13 Chair's Announcements**

Members were reminded that comments on the draft Neighbourhood Plan, circulated separately, were required by 8<sup>th</sup> November, and that there was a Site Allocation workshop in the Council Chamber at 1pm on 4<sup>th</sup> November.

**477/13 Dates of next meetings**

Full Council - Monday 20<sup>th</sup> January 2014  
Interim Council - Monday 16<sup>th</sup> December 2014

Meeting closed at 8.03 pm

**Signed** ..... **Date** .....