

Minutes of an **Interim Council Meeting** of Buckingham Town Council held at 7.10pm following the Public Session, on **Monday 25th July 2016** in the Council Chamber, Cornwalls Meadow, Buckingham.

Present:	Cllr. Ms. J. Bates	
	Cllr. T. Bloomfield	
	Cllr. M. Cole	
	Cllr. Mrs. M. Gateley	
	Cllr. P. Hirons	
	Cllr. D. Isham	
	Cllr. A. Mahi	Mayor
	Cllr. L. O'Donoghue	
	Cllr. M. Smith	
	Cllr. Mrs. C. Strain-Clark	
	Cllr. M. Try	
Invited Guests:	Mr. M. Massey	} IDPartnership
	Mr. S. Savin	
	Mr. D. Ladhar	} Ladhar Group/Crown Care Nick Kemp Associates
	Mr. N. Kemp	
	Mr. G. Stevenson	} Catesby Estates
	Mr. D. Neale	
	Ms. Silke Gruner	} Barton Willmore
	Mr. G. Gallagher	
Also Present:	Mr. D. Jones	} Deputy Town Clerk
	Mrs. K. McElligott	

249/16 Apologies

Apologies were received and accepted from Councillors J. Harvey, H. Mordue, Ms. R. Newell and R. Stuchbury (for late arrival).

250/16 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

251/16 Presentation – Proposed care home, Cornwalls Meadow

Mr. Massey outlined the concept of a care home akin to a hotel in landscaped and well-kept grounds on the land behind №13 High Street; it would have 68 rooms and 15 assisted living apartments. Crown Care had been working in this field for some 30 years with 40 homes, and were planning to expand into care villages. A town centre site was preferred; it was expected that 50% of residents would be capable of walking as far as the shops. The site was currently under-used, and the buildings would occupy about half of it, the rest (the river end) would be private garden and wild habitat buffer. The buildings were above the 1/100 year flood zone.

The principal access would be at the end of the car park access road, meaning the recycling skips would need to be re-sited. There would be 27 parking spaces for residents, staff and visitors, so there would be no call on the public car park spaces. There would be constructions jobs, and then 150 FTE staff places.

The street elevation had been designed to reflect the town centre buildings in height and materials, broken form, domestic scale and varied roofscape.

Members had comments and questions as follows:

- Locals were aware that serious flooding occurred approximately every 10 years, not every hundred;
- №13 High Street was well known for its loud music, Sky Sports and late hours; not a suitable environment for a care home – *the developers were aware of this, it would require negotiation;*
- The site was allocated to riverside walk and picnic area in the Neighbourhood Plan, and rated unsuitable for housing in the VALP site appraisal; the additional traffic would also have an adverse effect on the car park access;
- More than 150 staff would need more than 27 parking spaces – *they would be working shifts so not all on site at once; many would be local and able to walk to work; a shuttle bus might be organised for those further away; the site was well served by bus; the pressure on the High Street was recognised and would be discussed with Highways; the employment usage had been agreed with AVDC;*
- When the Town Council proposed putting new toilets on the recycling corner, it was told that it was too dangerous to have users crossing the car park access, and that it flooded; Cllr. O'Donoghue asked that this correspondence be collated and circulated;
- “Care Homes” came in various grades – assisted housing for the ambulant – bedridden – bedridden + nursing care – would this home cater for all these? – *yes, including nursing and dementia care, and tailored care for the ‘assisted living’ residents;*
- In the case of flooding or other emergency, how would 68 fragile patients be evacuated, as the proposed access does flood? – *the main entrance is for access to the parking, there will be a second (service) entrance to the rear which can be used in emergencies;*
- Is it wide enough for ambulances? – *yes*
- The red line boundary includes the car park IN lane – it goes right across to the pumping station from the recycling corner – *this may be a slip of the pen though the site does include the triangular area in front of the skips at the corner.*

The guests from Barton Willmore left the meeting

252/16 Presentation – application 16/02320/AOP, Maids Moreton

Mr. Stevenson gave a brief outline of the previous application, withdrawn in March, and how it differed from the present one, and how previous comments had been addressed. The housing had been sited away from the road to minimise landscape impact, and there would be 111 sale houses and 59 affordable houses (35%). On the housing requirements for the two settlements Buckingham was 557 short on a total of 2571 and Maids Moreton 67 on 69.

Ms. Gruner said that a density of 33 dwellings/hectare had been allowed, with the southwest quarter of the site being left as open space, partly due to its previous use as landfill. The lowest parts of the site, behind the A422 hedge, would have sustainable drainage ponds to attenuate run-off to openfield rates, and these would have woodland screening. There would be pedestrian links to the bridleway, and the housing on the western edge would face towards it. The central existing hedge would be maintained and augmented and would serve to break up views of the roofs with greenery.

Mr. Neale described the access on to the main road, a simple T-junction. A Safety Audit had not highlighted any issues. It was suggested that the 40mph speed limit be extended to east of the access. The bridleway would provide a link to Maids Moreton CE and Buckingham Primary Schools. Mill Lane had been assessed and was busy but not at capacity. It had been agreed that the trip rates and other data from the previous application were still current enough to be used. The town centre junctions had capacity issues whether with or without committed development being taken into account, but the developers were willing to negotiate a financial contribution to mitigation of the additional traffic to be expected from the development. There would also be contributions for education and healthcare provision.

There are two dates in September for AVDC SDMC meetings so the target decision date would be 22nd September latest.

Members had comments and questions as follows:

- The contribution to mitigation of traffic congestion at the town centre mini-roundabout junctions – what is being proposed? – *that is up to the Highway Authority to consider options;*
- Most of the benefits are for Maids Moreton, while most of the disadvantages are for Buckingham – how have you addressed previous comments on the impact on health services, education and shopping?
- There is no alternative access if the entry road in is blocked – what means would – say – a fire engine have of getting to the housing area? Some other way in, possibly with crash bollards, must be arranged; - *there is an alternative exit via an opening in the centre hedge, which could be connected with the entrance across the green space, or the bridleway could be used;*
- This Council is mindful of creepage via Minor (unconsulted-on) Amendments experienced on other developments, which results in a radically different result from the original approved plans, so would like to see any additions and changes thought through before the ADP stage.

253/16 Major Planning Application

16/02320/AOP

OPPOSE & ATTEND

Land East of Buckingham, Stratford Road (Maids Moreton Parish)

Outline Planning Application with access to be considered and all other matters reserved a residential development of up to 170 dwellings and general amenity space including open space; landscaped areas; sustainable drainage measures including balancing ponds for surface water attenuation; new access points for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists; associated engineering operation and all enabling and ancillary works.

Members considered this application, bearing in mind that it is not within our parish, therefore the BNDP policies are not applicable, though – as with the previous application – residents would be reliant on Buckingham for virtually all facilities, therefore adding perhaps 300 to the number of cars in the town, compounding traffic delays and putting pressure on car parking. The difference in height between the town centre and the site would not encourage walking and cycling for any but top-up shopping trips. For the less fit, this would also apply to the walking distance between the site and the Stratford Road bus stop (Hilltop Avenue can be discarded as a bus route; without a direct route to the Avenue from the site, the distance to be walked is similar and the request service only runs twice a day, once to Tesco and once from the town).

The increased number of traffic movements, though not as substantial as that for the earlier application, would still have an impact on the town centre, particularly the

pinch points at the Old Gaol and the Old Town Hall, and though the proposition that s106 money could solve either was made, no detail was suggested and it was difficult to see what money could do to ameliorate the situation.

Members felt that the access opposite Lockmeadow Farm, which houses a taxi business, was not ideal, especially for drivers turning right at peak hours.

The fact remains that Maids Moreton village has few facilities, no shop, doctor or dentist and an infants school only. Consequently the future residents must look to Buckingham to supply all the infrastructure and services, and no indication was found of proof of capacity.

The upgrading of the historic bridleway, much used by riders and dogwalkers, to cycleway conditions was regretted. In a related presentation, the applicant acknowledged the lack of an alternative access if the main one was blocked by an accident, and suggested that cautious use of the bridleway might be useful for emergency vehicles. Members did not agree, and asked that an alternative access be provided, perhaps with collapsible bollards to prevent casual use.

It was reiterated that both (Bourton Meadow is not, as stated again, a secondary school) senior schools are a considerable distance from the site and without cycle parking, so the likelihood of pupils walking or cycling to school is low. The employment areas of the town are even further, increasing traffic on the bypass or through town (the employment areas have no bus service).

Concern was also expressed that utility capacity, in particular the sewage disposal and broadband provision, was inadequate and accommodating this estate on land not designated for development would have an overall detrimental effect on existing residents' quality of life.

Members voted unanimously to OPPOSE & ATTEND.

The Planning Clerk apologises for an arithmetical error in the report supplied with the agenda; the percentage of journeys turning left from the access is 27.6% deduced from Table 9, plus an unknown fraction of the 13.2% of "other" destinations. Thus the majority of journeys to work would require a right turn across the A422.

254/16 VALP consultation working group

The following Members volunteered:

Cllr. Cole, Cllr. Hirons, Cllr. Isham & Cllr. Smith.

and the date of the first meeting set at 9.30am on Tuesday 2nd August 2016 in the Council Chamber.

The slides from the 13th July presentation had been circulated. Members felt it would be useful to have the record of the Q&A session which followed.

ACTION PLANNING CLERK

255/16 Chair's Announcements

None.

256/16 Dates of next meetings

Full Council - Monday 15th August 2016

Interim Council - Monday 12th September 2016

Meeting closed at 8.15pm

Signed **Date**