

Minutes of an **Interim Council Meeting** of Buckingham Town Council held at 7pm. on **Monday 28<sup>th</sup> July 2014** in the Council Chamber, Cornwalls Meadow, Buckingham.

Present: Cllr. T. Bloomfield  
 Cllr. H. Cadd  
 Cllr. Mrs. G. Collins  
 Cllr. P. Collins  
 Cllr. J. Harvey  
 Cllr. P. Hirons  
 Cllr. D. Isham  
 Cllr. R. Lehmann  
 Cllr. A. Mahi  
 Cllr. H. Mordue  
 Cllr. L. O'Donoghue (Mayor)  
 Cllr. M. Smith  
 Cllr. Mrs. C. Strain-Clark  
 Cllr. R. Stuchbury  
 Cllr. W. Whyte

Invited guests: Mr. Craig Dransfield Hightown Praetorian & Churches Housing Associations  
 Mr. Toby Malloy CMI Architecture Ltd.  
 Mr. Tim West Taylor French Developments

Also attending: Mr. C. Wayman Town Clerk  
 Mrs. K. McElligott *for the* Committee Clerk

#### 213/14 Apologies

Apologies were received and accepted from Cllr. Ms. R. Newell and Cllr. M. Try.

#### 214/14 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest at this point (see Min.218).

#### 215/14 Minutes

There had been no Interim Council meetings since the Annual Statutory Meeting in May.

#### 216/14 Motion:

Proposed by Cllr Harvey and seconded by Cllr Whyte, that this Council resolves to request the Town Clerk to explore options (as per our Parks Policy 'F10: The structure of the Heartlands should be improved to allow more variety of use – including more formal planting, an event space, art, etc. – to create a more coherent sense of place rather than just a green space to walk through') for creating an entertainment / picnic space involving options around a band stand type (modern or traditional) structure and/or terraforming an amphitheatre to be funded by s106 or NHB or such other external monies as can be secured.

Cllr. Lehman raised a point of order: Interim Council was intended for urgent matters only, and this motion was not urgent. Cllr. P. Collins supported, and proposed that the motion be postponed to the next Full Council.

**AGREED.**

**AUGUST 18<sup>TH</sup> AGENDA**

#### 217/14 Motion:

Proposed by Cllr. Whyte, that the town council considers the role of Milton Keynes hospital to be very important for the residents of Buckingham and North Bucks. It

agrees that it should review and comment on the “Bedfordshire and Milton Keynes Health Review”, particularly in the area of A&E services.

Cllr. Lehmann felt that this matter was also not urgent; Cllrs. Stuchbury and Whyte disagreed. The first part of this consultation had closed in June without input from the Buckingham area; Milton Keynes’ A&E was the most convenient for the north of the county, yet no invitation to the previous week’s public meeting had been issued. Members agreed to discuss the motion.

Cllr. Whyte noted that other services provided at MK were included, but the continuance of the A&E department was the most important. If it closed it would put additional pressure on Stoke Mandeville which would then be catering for the whole county. The AV CCG helped to fund the discharge function for patients at MK who lived in North Bucks, liaising with Social Services to enable them to return home with support.

Cllr. Stuchbury seconded the motion, and suggested that a letter be sent alerting local GPs to the consultation as well as to Beds & MK Health Review to include N. Bucks in the review area.

**AGREED including the suggested letters.**

**ACTION TOWN CLERK**

Background information was available from:

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-beds-bucks-herts-28156755>

*The Mayor declared a prejudicial interest at this point as her house belonged to Hightown Praetorian Housing Association*

**218/14 Presentation: a proposal for the Hamilton’s Precision site, Tingewick Rd.**

A plan and elevation drawing had been circulated with the agenda.

Mr. Dransfield noted that the housing association owned some 4000 dwellings in Herts and Bucks, and that this presentation was preliminary to lodging a planning application. The 10 units nearest the river were to be for sale, to aid the funding of the remaining 48 HA units, 16 of which would be Shared Ownership and 32 rental.

There was a mixture of types and sizes – 3 blocks of flats, some 3-bed houses, a terrace of 2-bed houses, 2 mews flats over a garage block, and the sale units were 4-bed. The existing access would be retained and the 2 blocks of flats at the entrance were designed to give a frontage presence; he had noted that the neighbouring site (13/03139/ADP; application withdrawn) had ‘turned its back’ to the main road. There was a large car park area to serve the flats. The design was not too contemporary and traditional scale, materials and finishes were proposed to fit in with the area. The three coloured lines on the plan indicated the flood zone extents. They were willing to consider a path joining the existing walk behind Fishers Field to the one proposed on the industrial area site (on the last amended drawing).

Members advocated asking Hamiltons about actual flooding levels, as the EA maps did not give a true picture.

In answer to a question about the new workings of the Bucks Home Choice scheme, Hightown Praetorian confirmed that they complied with the Aylesbury Vale requirements.

Asked whether they had established a demand for the types of units proposed – Candleford Court is still advertising – they were happy that demand existed for both sale and shared ownership. They had seen that the BNDP considered a need for several 100 affordable units over the period covered by the Plan.

Members noted that, with an aging population, more smaller and/or accessible units would be required, and this site was convenient for the town centre and ideal for

older people wishing to down-size. The terrace houses were too small, and the (3-storey, garage on the ground floor) town houses too tall. Had bungalows been considered? These were not lifetime housing, to be adapted as circumstances changed; had this been taken into account or were residents expected to move elsewhere as their needs expanded or contracted? Mr. Dransfield said that the units were not designed to be wheel-chair accessible, flats were difficult to design for lifetime use, and bungalows were land-hungry. Members expressed disappointment at the opportunity missed and pointed out that down-sizing often released substantial capital, and bungalows could be priced accordingly for sale and allowed a smaller garden.

Cllr. Whyte considered that access could have been shared with the site to the west, and that the developers had mis-read the street scene on Tingwick Road, making particular reference to the 1½ storey stone cottages at the front of Fishers field. He was also concerned about the likely use of the car park by youngsters in the absence of any play areas. Mr. Dransfield agreed the context was tricky; the university buildings opposite were on a higher base level so they had designed effectively 2½ storey buildings utilising the roof space as habitable rooms. The car park had to be that size to comply with AVDC's parking guidelines. A certain amount of green open space had been incorporated.

The visitors were thanked for coming, and left the meeting.

#### **219/14 New bus shelter for the High Street bus stand**

BCC/TfB had sent through four choices of bus shelter styles and two of live display units, asking for members' opinion. Cllr. Whyte added that most were system units and could be as long as required, and several colours were also available. He also pointed out that paint implied more maintenance than steel construction. Members should also consider whether they would prefer one large or two small shelters.

After discussion, Members voted 7 for design A (Chester) and 7 for design D (pr1); the Mayor's casting vote went to **design D**.

Members agreed that two would be acceptable only if one large shelter would not fit in the space available, and that the roof should be solid not glazed to lessen cleaning. Lighting would be an advantage. Members agreed that the choice of colour be left to the officer.

Further discussion on the type of display (free-standing or integral to the shelter) produced a vote of 12:1 for the free-standing **design A (Bann flag)** as it would also act as an advertisement for the frequency of services and encourage bus use.

**ACTION TOWN CLERK**

#### **220/14 New Toilets & surrounding works, Cornwalls Meadow**

Three tenders had been sought for the toilets but one had only submitted prices for the building without the plumbing. The remaining two, with the three tenders for the paving and other exterior works had been collated into a report circulated at the meeting. The sealed bids had been opened in the presence of the Town Clerk, Deputy Town Clerk and Cllr. Smith per Financial Regulations. Cllr. Mills had also been consulted and had advocated three cubicles rather than two. The Town Clerk had investigated a disabled toilet cubicle fitted with a hoist and other associated equipment, but this would require much more space than was available and a considerably greater cost. Once the tender was agreed, planning permission would be sought and hopefully received in time to apply for NHB funding.

Members discussed the tenders received and the different layouts offered, preferring more spacious cubicles and rather smaller storage space. Cllr. Strain-

Clark hoped for sensible placing of wall-mounted bins and projections so as not to obstruct movement for wheelchair users. She was also against auto-flushing on opening the door, preferring individual control using 'no-touch' sensors for flushing and taps.

Cllr. Whyte had some criticisms of the design as the building was in a very visible position; bollard placement needed more thought, and perhaps there could be fewer. He was concerned at the use of a resin-bonded surface and would prefer the block pavers re-laid at an appropriate level as being more durable, and cyclists using the new path would arrive in front of the doors. He would also like to see the path the same width as the bridge and signage to indicate the limit of the cycle zone. Cycle stands should be of the Sheffield type..

Cllr. Mordue reiterated his opinion that the siting was wrong, the toilets should be in an extension to the Community Centre and incorporating Shopmobility, not on a dangerous corner. He was reminded that this proposal had been abandoned due to legal problems with access.

Cllr. Stuchbury proposed that Tender A be selected, taking the above comments into consideration, and called for a recorded vote.

*Cllr. Mordue left the meeting.*

Further discussion agreed a brick exterior and tile roof to match the Community Centre.

Proposed by Cllr. Stuchbury, seconded by Cllr. O'Donoghue, that Tender A be selected for the toilet building; **AGREED** unanimously by the remaining Councillors.

Proposed by Cllr. Lehmann, seconded by Cllr. O'Donoghue, that Tender B be selected for the surrounding works, taking into consideration the comments made in the meeting; **AGREED** unanimously by the remaining Councillors.

**ACTION DEPUTY TOWN CLERK**

**221/14 Chairman's Announcements**

None.

**222/14 Date of next Meetings:**

Full Council 18<sup>th</sup> August 2014;  
Interim Council 15<sup>th</sup> September 2014

Meeting closed at 8.05pm

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