



BUCKINGHAM TOWN COUNCIL

TOWN COUNCIL OFFICES, THE BUCKINGHAM CENTRE,
VERNEY CLOSE, BUCKINGHAM MK18 1JP

Telephone/Fax: (01280) 816 426

Email: office@buckingham-tc.gov.uk
www.buckingham-tc.gov.uk

Town Clerk: Mr C. P. Wayman



Councillors,

Tuesday, 13 January 2015

You are summoned to a meeting of the Full Council of Buckingham Town Council to be held on **Monday 19th January 2015** at 7pm in the Council Chamber, Cornwalls Meadow, Buckingham.

Mr C. P. Wayman
Town Clerk

Please note that the Full Council will be preceded by a Public Session in accordance with Standing Order 1.3, which will last for a maximum of 15 minutes.

AGENDA

1. Apologies for Absence

Members are asked to receive apologies from members.

2. Declarations of Interest

To receive declarations of any personal or prejudicial interest under consideration on this agenda in accordance with the Localism Act 2011 Sections 26-34 & Schedule 4.

3. Minutes

To receive the minutes and confirm the recommendations therein of the Full Council Meeting held on Monday 24th November 2014.

Copy previously circulated BTC/07/14

4. Interim Minutes

To receive the minutes and confirm the recommendations therein of the Interim Council meeting held on Monday 22nd December 2014.

Copy previously circulated IM/04/14

5. Planning Committee

To receive the minutes and confirm the recommendations therein of the Planning Committee meetings held on:

- Monday 1st December 2014

Copy previously circulated PL/09/14

Proposed by Cllr Smith, seconded by Cllr Stuchbury and **RECOMMENDED** to Full Council that the recommendation be taken forward with the above comments.

That the Town Council Office work with other parish and town Councils and BCC on cycling signage outside of the town boundary.

That initial discussions are held with the Canal Society and BCC over possible funding for cycle development along the old canal route. If this is viable, then to be progressed.

Buckingham



Twinned with Mouvaux, France



Proposed by Cllr Stuchbury, seconded by Cllr Smith and **RECOMMENDED** to Full Council that the Town Council publicly express the desire to be part of s106 discussions at the earliest stage with AVDC; and to write to the Secretary of State to ascertain the Town Council's legal position to be included in such discussions with developer's and the District Council.

- Monday 22nd December 2014

Copy previously circulated PL/10/14

6. Environment Committee

To receive the minutes and confirm the recommendations therein of the Environment Committee meeting held on Monday 15th December 2014.

Copy previously circulated E/05/14

This Committee **RECOMMENDS** to the Full Council that the Town Council should look to take the [grass-cutting and other maintenance services] work in house or engage with David Letts on providing a model along the lines of Stewkley and brings back the findings to the Council in time for a decision to be made for a start in April 2015.

Proposed by Cllr. Smith, seconded by Cllr. Stuchbury, and **RECOMMENDED** that this Council identify a source of match funding of £2000 for the promotion of Access Awareness.

7. Town Centre and Events Committee

To receive the minutes and confirm the recommendations therein of the Town Centre and Events Committee meetings held on Monday 8th December 2014.

Copy previously circulated TCE/05/14

8. Resources Committee

To receive the minutes and confirm the recommendations therein of the Finance, Administration and Personnel Committee meeting held on Monday 10th November and Monday 5th January 2014.

Copy previously circulated R/04/14

Copy previously circulated R/05/14

Members **AGREED** the recommendations and **RECOMMENDED** to Full Council to increase the Accounts Assistants hours by four hours a week.

9. Motion – Cllr P Collins

To propose the Red Cross Centre, (and its land) on our "Community Right to Bid".

10. Motion – Cllr Stuchbury

To discuss Towns against Tax Dodging initiative, Members are requested to view the attached link:

www.townsagainsttaxdodging.org.uk/councillors?utm_source=campaigns&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Councilloremail

11. Motion – Cllr Harvey, seconder Cllr Stuchbury

This Council resolves to ask the Town Clerk to work with the local Scouts & wider Scouting movement to investigate the feasibility of preparing a joint bid to the National Lottery to bring the Embleton Way Community Centre into action as a new Scouting HQ for the Town. After such investigation, the Town Clerk to bring back his view to this Council for what Council resources will be required to build a successful joint bid and hence his recommendations for what should be done.

12. Motion – Cllr Mrs G Collins

In the interest of openness and democracy that nominations for Mayor be submitted to the town clerk at least 2 weeks prior to our meeting to elect the Mayor and that any nominations be made available to all councillors 1 week prior to the meeting to elect the Mayor.

13. Land East of Buckingham – Developer presentation – Barton Willmore Planning Consultants

To receive a presentation

14. Major Planning Application - 15/00051/AOP Land East of Buckingham, Stratford Rd, Maids Moreton

Catesby Estates Ltd

Outline planning permission with means of access to be determined and all other matters reserved for up to 400 dwellings; a community hall/changing facility; general amenity space including open space and sports provision; 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. To receive a report from the Planning Clerk with comments on the above application.

FC/53/14

15. Action List

To receive and discuss the list.

Appendix A

16. Buckingham Neighbourhood Plan

16.1 To receive and discuss a report from Tibbalds

Appendix B

16.2 To receive the Neighbourhood Plan and agree to go to pre-submission

(Members are requested to note that due to the size of documents, all documents will be emailed)

17. Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library and Museum

To receive and discuss a letter, and agree a response

Appendix C

18. Buckingham General Charities

To receive and discuss a request for a new Trustee

Appendix D

19. Aylesbury Vale Community Safety Partnership

To receive a newsletter from AVDC

Appendix E

20. Proposed Base Station Upgrade at Buckingham Builders Merchants, Stratford Rd

To receive and discuss a letter from Maxema Ltd *(Members are requested to note the response date has been extended to 23rd January)*

Appendix F

21. To receive reports from District and County Councillors

22. Buckingham Economic Group

To receive an agenda for the next meeting on 14th January 2015 for information (attached minutes from 6th August 2014 for information)

Appendix G

23. Reports from Representatives on Outside Bodies

Members are asked to note the reports listed below:

Aylesbury Vale Transport Users Group minutes 2nd December 2014

Appendix H

Buckingham Community Centre Management minutes 22nd May and 9th October 2014

Appendix I

Buckingham and Maids Moreton NAG minutes 26th November 2014

Appendix J

Buckingham Twinning Association AGM Minutes 18 November 2014

Appendix K

24. Mayoral Engagements

To receive a list of events attended by the Mayor and Deputy Mayor.

Functions the Mayor has attended:

13/11/2014	11:00 - 12:00	Christmas lights switch on meeting
14/11/2014	19:45 - 21:45	BAFA Exhibition @ the Community Centre
16/11/2014	15:30 - 16:45	Return to BAFA for prize giving @ the CC
24/11/2014	18:45 - 21:15	Chaired Full Council
07/12/2014	14:30 - 16:30	MK Mayor civic service
11/12/2014	18:40 - 20:30	Attended the Buckingham School Awards Evening to present the Mayors Award for Service to School and the Community
13/12/2014	8:30 - 14:00	Invited to participate in the Christmas Parade (also went to Comm' Centre afterwards for Xmas market etc)
16/12/2014	18:15 - 19:45	Invited to the MK Dons meeting at the Old Town Hall
22/12/2014	18:30 - 21:25	Chaired Interim Council with mince pies, Buck's Fizz & a Happy Christmas!

Functions the Deputy Mayor has attended:

None attended

25. News Releases

26. Chair's Announcements

27. Date of the next meeting: Interim Council – Monday 16th February 2015
Full Council - Monday 9th March 2015

15/00051/AOP

Response date 5th February 2015

Land East of Buckingham

Outline planning permission with means of access to be determined and all other matters reserved for up to 400 dwellings; a community hall/changing facility; general amenity space including open space and sports provision; 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.

This application is not in our parish, so details of design are not really within our remit for comments (the actual house designs do not form part of this application anyway); however the Design & Access Statement does rather emphasise Buckingham characteristics, and not those of Maids Moreton (they have used the SPG based on our V&D statement). The applicants acknowledge the lack of facilities in Maids Moreton and assume that Buckingham will supply most of residents' needs. This report therefore concentrates on those aspects of infrastructure, in particular traffic, most likely to be affected, though there is no obvious evidence of research into capacity of surgeries or schools to cope.

Changes since the pre-application exhibition at Maids Moreton Parish Hall are the substitution of a junior playing pitch and 2 tennis courts for the senior football pitch at the northern end of the site, and link paths (1) through to a footpath along the verge of Mill Lane into the village by the Church, and (2) through the NW corner of the site to the gate across the access to the existing playground. These form part of the open space across the whole width of the northern end of the site, so that buildings are not crowding up to the existing housing or the Church and graveyard. Vehicle access to the changing rooms, pitch and courts is via the A422 access roundabout and the whole length of the estate. The pattern of housing is a good deal more realistic than the rather diagrammatic drawings at the exhibition. There is no breakdown of housing types/sizes at this stage; a density of 30/ha is proposed. The street layout is, as usual, a potential postman's nightmare, like Lace Hill. There is to be a little on-street parking on the spine road/potential bus route, though most of the houses seem to have adequate driveways and are separated by planting from the road. Other roads may also have on-street parking, though this is unclear. Cycle parking will be in garages/garden sheds or other secure areas. Parking courts will be a maximum of 10 spaces. Not all side streets have a footway on both sides. It is unclear why part of Mill Lane (from the rear of Church Close to the bridleway across the fields to the east) is included in the red-edge plan. There are three play areas (all LEAPs) within the housing area (plus, of course, the existing playground is just outside the site boundary). There will be affordable housing; 30% = 120 houses, location, tenure & mix to be decided at a later stage. NHB contribution is estimated at £3,396,400. Houses on the edges of the development, facing St Edmunds, Mill Lane and Stratford Road are to be 2 storey, those in the central part 2½ storeys.

Members are reminded that any matter agreed at AOP stage will be treated as set in stone by AVDC, even if no details are provided and the detailed plans are radically different when received (see Lace Hill School, which changed position on the site, shape and orientation between AOP and ADP stages, and on which our comments were ignored; similarly the riverbank playground at Tingewick Road Industrial Estate which did not appear at all on the drawings at AOP stage, and which Members did not consider a safe or sensible site for play equipment).

located within close proximity to bus stops with frequent services to local facilities and amenities. See 3.6.1 below.

1.9 The estimated traffic generation of the proposals will not result in a material impact on the highway network. See 5.6 below.

3.6.1 The nearest bus stop to the site is on Hilltop Avenue approximately 480m to the west of the centre of the site. This bus stop is served by bus service 132 operated by Redline, which routes from Buckingham – Water Stratford – Brackley (- Banbury). There are further bus stops located within Maids Moreton on Avenue Road approximately 550m north west of the centre of the site. This bus stop is served by the number 60 bus service operated by Arriva, which operates from Aylesbury – Milton Keynes every two hours.

There is no actual bus stop on Hilltop Avenue. It is a request service; it runs once a day each way and goes through Linden Village, Badgers & Bourtonville to the London Road Tesco (only). It is possible to change at Tesco for Brackley, but there would be an hour's wait. There are 4 buses a day from the High Street bus stand to Brackley, so that would be better information. Banbury is only accessible by bus on Saturdays – two buses, but these turn and come back immediately, so effectively there is only the 10.10 returning at 14.55. The 60/X60 service that goes round Maids Moreton every two hours does not go to Milton Keynes, it returns to Aylesbury. Passengers for MK would have to change at the bus stand in the High Street (20 min. wait). The Design and Access Statement says, incorrectly, that this is a half-hourly service.

Neither of these services runs on a Sunday.

3.6.3 A number of bus services route past the site along the A422 Stratford Road frontage, but do not currently stop in the vicinity of the site. These include bus services X5, X60 and 88. Bus service X5 operates from Cambridge to Oxford via Bedford, Milton Keynes and Buckingham on a 30 minute frequency. Bus service 88 operates a Friday and Saturday only service with two services during the day. Bus service X60 operates from Aylesbury to Milton Keynes via Buckingham on a 30 minute frequency.

The X5 is half-hourly, but as an express service is unlikely to make an extra stop for a housing estate. The X60 is half-hourly in peak hours Aylesbury-Buckingham and hourly otherwise, and hourly from Buckingham - Milton Keynes (having replaced the hourly 32 bus). The nearest stop currently is the Stratford Road layby for to and from MK. Arriva might consider a new bus stop for this estate, but given the complete failure over many years to get a stop anywhere between Buckingham & MK rail station (even at school times for Deanshanger) it might be better to assume not until proved otherwise. The 88 is an evening service (returning from MK at 20.20 & 23.45 on Friday and Saturday nights).

3.7.3 Bourton Meadow Academy is not a secondary school (they have grouped it with The Buckingham School and RLS).

3.8.3 Within these residential areas (such as Glebe Close, Church Close, Watlow Gardens and Hilltop Avenue) there are well established pedestrian footways with 30mph speed limits....there is little likelihood of this limit being breached, even downhill on a skateboard!

3.8.4 lists cycle routes; this is lazy research, comprising the four leisure routes* on the

bypass roundabout, London Road bypass roundabout and Old Gaol roundabout are all calculated as having adequate capacity for the additional traffic, and will have (only just, in some cases) until 2031. Mitigation of the effect of 400 new dwellings by junction modification is proposed.

The two secondary schools are just within a 2km circle centred on the site, and the employment areas on the bypass just beyond it. Even with a safe route through the parks etc, pupils are unlikely to walk this far especially in winter/bad weather. The secondary schools do not provide secure cycle parking. If bus stops can be agreed for the site, the hourly (A422) or two-hourly (Avenue Road) 60/X60 would provide a bus route direct to the London Road schools, but parents would have to pay. Maids Moreton CE (pre-school and infants) and Buckingham Primary (nursery, infants and juniors) are within easy walking distance of the site; Bourton Meadow less so, especially as there is no footway along the bypass (although the bridleway along the eastern side would be OK in dry weather even with a pushchair) but Lace Hill School, even via the bridleway off the Bletchley Road roundabout, would be quite a way for young children to walk.

An immense number of pages of traffic calculations then follows.

Travel Plan (Appendix M)

Travel Plans are site-specific and aim to reduce the number of car trips to fewer than is predicted by the desk calculations for the number of dwellings. **"They also require continuous monitoring and refinement in order to be successful."**

The Plan repeats the incorrect bus frequency/destination information noted above, and the inclusion of Bourton Meadow as a secondary school.

The Plan includes the aspirational ambitions common to all such, the appointment of a Travel Plan Co-ordinator, literature distributed in the Welcome Pack, including bus timetables and a survey form to provide a baseline for the future surveys of peak hour travel movements. Targets for traffic movements will be adjusted to reflect the number of occupied dwellings. The aim is to reduce the number of car trips by 3% from the calculated number in the Assessment.

Flood Risk & Drainage Strategy.

The land has been in agricultural use and has no watercourses; only land drains, no sewers. The closest foul water sewers are in Page Hill. No part of the site is in the flood plain. Though springs may become active after long periods of rain, the slope of the site is expected to provide adequate run-off routes via the existing land drainage. The EA Surface Water map shows any likely surface water will be towards the eastern side, and flow through the areas retained as open space. The development proposed passes the Sequential test for site suitability from the flooding point of view.

Surface Water run-off will be sent via the two attenuation ponds so that the rate of drainage into the surrounding ditches and eventually the river is equivalent to what it would have been if the fields had not been developed. Planting will aid filtration of the water before it is discharged via a control valve.

Properties will be equipped with water butts to reduce the volume of water discharged into the drainage system.

The foul water sewer system will be connected direct to the sewage works, though Anglian Water will have to liaise over time schedules as work will have to be carried out to accommodate the additional demand before occupation. [Members will recollect what happened at Lace Hill].



- | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Application site | ① Access off new roundabout | ⑩ Emergency vehicle access |
| Proposed bus route | ② Proposed bus route | ⑪ New playing fields |
| Proposed new footways | ③ Balancing ponds | ⑫ Community heli-charging rooms and car parking |
| Bridleway upgraded to cycle route | ④ Swales | |
| Public footpath upgraded to bridleway | ⑤ Children's Equipped Play Areas (LEAP) | |
| Existing public footpath retained | ⑥ New footway/cycleway along north of Stratford Road | |
| Proposed bridleway | ⑦ New footway along west of Mill Lane (College Road) | |
| Emergency vehicle access | ⑧ Vista to St. Edmund's Church | |
| Proposed pedestrian/cycle links | ⑨ New allotments | |

CSa

East of Buckingham
Stratford Road
Buckingham MK18 1JH

Colas Exeter Ltd

1/1556 @ A1
December 2014
CSa/24/76/100

CS
SG
A

ACTION LIST

FULL COUNCIL, INTERIM COUNCIL & EXTRAORDINARY MEETINGS

Subject	Meeting date/ Minute	Action taken	Form	Response received
Festival of Health	30 th June 2014 133.1/14		Town Clerk to explore possibility	
Councillors Photographs	30 th June 2014 133.4/14		Cllr. Newell to arrange for invoicing	
Dispensation	30 th June 2014 142/14		Cllr. Isham to amend form and resubmit	
Toilets	28 th July 2014 220/14		DTC & TC to arrange for the construction	Planning Permission granted
20mph Speed Limits	6 th Oct 2014 389/14		To complete report on 20mph areas following information gathered on accidents	
Community Centre Lease	6 th Oct 2014 393/14		Draw up funding Plan for Community Centre	

Tibbalds

Buckingham Neighbourhood Plan Review

January 2015

1 Introduction

1.1 General background to Plan

The draft Buckingham Neighbourhood Plan allocates land for over 1,000 residential dwellings, and as such contains some significant policies. It is supported by an Evidence Base document, Sustainability Appraisal and Site Assessment document. Although not required until the Regulation 16 submission to the Local Planning Authority, a draft Consultation Statement and Basic Conditions Statement have been produced.

The Buckingham Neighbourhood Plan has had a difficult journey. Initially, the Plan was intended to cover both the Buckingham Town Council area and an area within Radcliffe-Cum-Chackmore Parish Council. However, the Parish Council decided it no longer wished its area to be part of the Neighbourhood Plan and so Buckingham Town Council has gone ahead with a Neighbourhood Plan for the Town Council area plus a small parcel of land from neighbouring Gawcott, within Lenborough Parish Council. A pre-submission (Regulation 14) Plan was produced in June 2014 and consulted upon.

Unfortunately, in re-designating the area a boundary error was made by Aylesbury Vale District Council. This has led to the requirement for both:

- re-consultation on the Neighbourhood Area designation, which concluded on 7th November; and
- re-consultation on the draft Neighbourhood Plan early in 2015.

Buckingham Town Council has taken the opportunity to make further revision to the Neighbourhood Plan following the June 2014 consultation, and so the version that will be consulted upon early in 2015 has been further refined.

1.2 What Tibbalds have been appointed to do

Given the significance of the Plan, the Town Council appointed Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design to provide a critical appraisal of the Plan and its supporting documentation. Tibbalds has extensive experience of Neighbourhood Planning, having led the work on the Thame Neighbourhood Plan, Winsford Neighbourhood Plan and the Chalfont St Peter Neighbourhood Plan.

Tibbalds has reviewed the various documents, focussing on the Neighbourhood Plan itself, and met with the Town Council to discuss the Plan. This report sets out our findings and makes recommendations for changes.

2 The November 2014 Pre-Submission Consultation Neighbourhood Plan

2.1 General Observations

Generally, the plan is well structured and organised. It clearly sets out the vision and objectives. These are translated into a series of themes under which the subsequent NPDP policies are grouped. However, we do have a number of concerns about areas of weaknesses within the Plan that should be addressed prior to the next stage of consultation. Specific examples are drawn out in the review below, however in summary the areas of particular concern are:

- There is a repetition of higher-level policy throughout the plan. If higher level policies (such as those set out in the National Planning Policy Framework or in AVDC's Local Plan) are particularly relevant to a Neighbourhood Plan, then the NP should 'tailor' it to the specific issues of the local area by adding to or expanding higher level policy, not just repeating it
- Planning policies should be clear so that both developers and planning officers have no doubt as to what is expected. The Plan includes a number of policies that lack clarity or fail to communicate their purpose. For example, the policy attempting to link the development of student accommodation with the development of academic accommodation at the University is not set out in a way that can secure this..
- There are areas where text that explains the planning policy and the policy text itself are muddled. It is the text contained within the policy that will be used to control development. Text within explanatory will provide additional detail, however, you cannot make requirements in the explanatory text that are not mentioned in the policy.
- The policies in relation to the By-Pass have no evidence to support them and relate to land outside of the designated area. These should be removed.
- There are policies and text copied verbatim from other Neighbourhood Plans (Thame, Exeter and Chalfont St Peter) that infringe copyright. More importantly, as these are drawn from other Plans, there is a risk that they are not specific to Buckingham's issues and may contain out-of-date or irrelevant information.

2.2 Introduction

This section provides a good introduction to Neighbourhood planning that is clearly set out and easy to follow. There are a couple more specific points to be addressed. These are as follows:

- Pages 6, Paragraph 1.10 is confusing. The last sentence states that: 'Development will be limited solely to a resulting shortfall in numbers.' You cannot limit numbers as any future local plan has the ability to deliver many more new homes. This sentence should be removed.
- Page 7, paragraph 1.1.8. You need to explain here that this version of the plan may be amended in response to the consultation exercise before being submitted to AVDC.

2.3 Background

This section is well written and provides a good overview of the Neighbourhood Area. However, it would benefit greatly from some basic maps that show the layout of the town

and locate some of the key buildings/uses identified and the character areas in Section 2.4.8.

2.4 Vision and Objectives

This chapter is clearly set out and follows a logical structure.

However, as discussed at the meeting, we are concerned about paragraph 4.2.3, which commits to review the Plan every five years. Any changes made to the Plan will automatically require the plan to go out to public consultation, be re-examined and be subject to a further referendum. This is a huge undertaking and potentially risky as any referendum could result in a 'no' vote, bringing the life of the Neighbourhood Plan to an end. We recommend that the Town Council simply commits to monitoring the plan over time. These same comments apply to para 5.4 on page 27 and para 6.2 on page 29

Paragraph 3.6 refers to 11 objectives, however, there are 12 listed. This should be corrected.

Figure 4.2 is not clear as the colour in the key for the Proposed Housing Development does not match the plan. The Cemetery needs to be labelled as 'Proposed Cemetery'. We note that the By-Pass alignment is omitted – and support this, as we recommend that the policies relating to the By-Pass are also deleted.

The plan on page 25 needs a figure number for ease of reference. Not clear whether Local Designated Green Space is proposed or already protect by policy.

2.5 Housing and Phasing Policies

In our experience, housing allocations and the associated policies are the riskiest area of Neighbourhood Plans as these are likely to receive the greatest numbers of representations at both the Regulation 14 and 16 consultations, and receive the greatest scrutiny from the Independent Examiner. Therefore, housing policies need to be very well considered and supported by a robust evidence base. We have the following observations on the policies:

- **HP1 – Allocate land for 617 new dwellings:** Supporting text in para 6.2. Is it realistic for Site M to be brought forward for, say, only 28 dwellings if Site K fails to come forward? What infrastructure is needed to support the development of Site M? For example, if improved road access is required, it is likely that the developer will argue for a greater number of dwellings than the shortfall in order to make the development viable. A clearer commitment to a timescale (avoiding reference to the review of the Plan) is needed – say, halfway through the life of the Plan? Suggest you discuss this with AVDC planners.
- **HP2 – Allocate land for 400 new rooms for University Expansion:** The sentiment of this policy appears to be that any expansion of the University must be accompanied by the delivery of new student housing. This policy is not sufficiently tight to lock the University into doing this. The policy needs to be closely linked to Policy EE9 and clearly require that the University delivers new housing alongside academic buildings. However – given that the University already has planning permission for its proposals – we are doubtful that this policy can have much influence.
- **HP3 - Allocate for self build:** This policy states that self-build development on Site H will be exempt from affordable housing requirements, and goes on to state that 'other proposals on allocated sites or windfall sites would be welcomed'. We feel this sets a dangerous precedent for development on other sites where developers may use self-

build as a vehicle to avoid the requirement for affordable housing. This policy should be rephrased to make it specific to Site H only.

- **HP4 – Provide a diverse housing mix:** This policy should remove the reference to bungalows. Developers are extremely unlikely to deliver this type of dwelling and therefore we recommend changing this to 'smaller more manageable units.' The explanatory text states that developments should not have large areas of the same **style** of housing. We recommend removing this requirement, so that this policy focuses only on dwelling sizes, leaving design for design-specific policies.
- **Policy HP5 – Provide affordable housing:** The explanatory text in 6.10 requires planning applications of over 1ha or more to be accompanied with an 'Affordable Housing Plan'. This requirement is not stated with the policy text and it is not clear what an affordable housing plan is and what it will achieve. The Town Council need to explain this more precisely, and refer to it in the policy text so that it can be enforced
- **HP6 – Provide a phasing strategy:** The title of HP6 is misleading. Rather than providing a phasing strategy it is simply saying that no building of housing on the allocated sites (apart from HP2 and HP7) will be commenced before 2016. It would be more accurate to call this policy 'Phasing'. The infrastructure section is vague and does not place specific requirements on developers. It is not clear what the issues relating to sewage are or who's responsibility it will be to rectify these. (Anglian water or developers?).
- **HP7 – Provide Guidelines for windfall sites:** The title of this policy is misleading as it does not relate to the text. It is making guidelines for windfall sites not requesting them. Therefore it should be there for simply called 'Guidelines for Windfall Sites'. Much of the guidance detailed in this text will be covered by higher-level policy (such as the statement that windfall sites should not adversely impact on heritage assets). As the intent of the policy appears to be to support brownfield development, it would be enough for the policy to state that; 'Development for small development sites within the built up area of the town will be supported'.
- **HP8 –Houses in Multiple Occupancy:** This policy has been taken from the Exeter Neighbourhood Plan – we recommend contacting the Exeter Forum to seek their permission to use the text. The government's definition of HMO is 'Small shared dwelling houses occupied by between 3 and 6 unrelated individuals as their only or main residence, who share amenities such as a kitchen or bathroom. We recommend that the policy included the upper number cap. Final bullet point – how is 'over concentration' defined? However, given that the Use Classes Order permits change of use between C3 (dwelling houses) to C4 (HMOs) without the need for a planning application, it is difficult to see how this policy could be enforced.

2.6 Design Heritage and Environment

This section aims to preserve Buckingham's 'Market Town' character. This is a valid intention, however, there is considerable repetition of higher level policy in this chapter and – as explained above – this is problematic.

- **DHE1 – Conservation and enhancement of the Conservation Area's special characteristics:** This policy simply repeats higher level policy. Unless there are any specific additional points that the Plan wishes to address, this policy should be removed.

Tibbalds

- **DHE2 – Protect existing trees and provision of trees in development:** This seems to add to higher level policy (particularly in its reference to local native tree species) and therefore can be retained as it is.
- **DHE3 – Enhancing the special characteristic of Buckingham rooflines:** To be effective, a design policy like this needs to (i) be supported by an evidence base that explains the principles of how Buckingham's varied roofscape contributes to the town's character; and (ii) be clear on what is expected of developers – as currently worded, a flat roof extension would meet the requirements of the second bullet point of para 7.5 – and we are sure this is not what you want to achieve.
- The concern in this policy seems to be around design quality more generally, and ensuring that new development relates to the character of the town. The Town Council does not have the time to undertake a thorough character assessment of the town to support design policies that relate to more than just rooflines prior to the next stage of consultation. However, there is already a reasonable evidence base for a design guide in the Buckingham Town Design Group's Vision and Design Statement in 2001 and presumably in AVDC's Conservation Area Appraisal. These would good sources from which to develop a Buckingham-specific design guide addressing broader issues of layout, materials, scale, landscape detailing and elevation and roofline. We therefore suggest that you replace policy DHE3 with something along the lines of '**DHE3: Buckingham Design Guide:** The Town Council will produce a design guide for the Neighbourhood Plan area. All new development shall accord with the requirements of the design guide.'
- **DHE4 Minimising the impact on natural habitats; DHE5- Protecting sites of significant ecological value; and DHE6 Protection of designated sites and priority habitats and species:** These policies appear to be covered in paras 109, 119, 118 of the NPPF. The Town Council should remove these policies unless there are any specific points that are not covered by the NPPF.
- **DHE7 – Provision of Green Infrastructure in relation to habitats; DHE8 Protection of movement corridors; and DHE9 – Biodiversity in Development:** These policies repeat text from the Local Planning Authority's Green Infrastructure Strategy. The status of this document needs to be confirmed. If it is a statutory document, there is no need to repeat information. Only specific additional requirements should be included in this policy.
- **DHE10 – Provision of good quality outdoor space:** We do not recommend that site K is made completely exempt from the provision of outdoor space – for example, balconies or terraces could provide good quality outdoor space appropriate to the urban environment. The text states that planning permission will be given where 'appropriate levels' of external open space. What is meant by appropriate?
- **DH11 - Design of developments in relation to the site boundary requirements:** There is a contradiction between the content of the policy text and the explanatory text. The policy relates to boundary treatments (fences, hedges etc). The explanatory text describes the spacing between buildings and building lines. These are different subjects.
- **Para 7.11** is policy not supporting text. It gives guidance on the acceptable distance between buildings with reference to privacy. This distance given relates to historic guidelines relating to daylight and sunlight rather than privacy (although many local authorities have confused the two). If the reason for the policy is privacy, then the back-to-back distance should not increase with height. Consider the impact of this policy on achieving development that fits with the historic character of Buckingham – it

is likely that the urban core of the town has back-to-back distances considerably less than 22 metres.

- **DH12- Requirement to provide and adhere to a Design and Access Statement.** This is discussed later on in this note.

2.7 Culture, Leisure and Health Policies

We commend this chapter for identifying the potential of a neighbourhood plan to create Local Green Spaces and think strategically about how these could be linked into a broader green infrastructure. With some tweaks these policies have the potential to be strong and deliverable. Our main concern in this chapter is that there is the ability of the plan to deliver the community facilities it sets out. There are also some 'prohibitive policies' that need to be reworded. We make the following comments and suggestions:

- **CLH1 – Allocate land for a community building; CLH3 – To allocate land for sports facilities and associated buildings; and CLH4 – To provide a cultural arts centre:** There is doubt whether any of these policies can be delivered. No sources of funding are mentioned, and it is not clear who will take the lead in delivering the facilities. The sites specified do not appear to be capable of delivering a community facility (which will generate no revenue for whoever develops it). The Wharf Yard site may come forward for development, a detailed planning application for a mixed-use development has been submitted for Market Hill and reserve site M may never come forward for development.
- Would it be possible to locate all of these facilities in one building and state that the plan will 'work towards a strategy' to deliver these? A site within an existing park or land owned by the Council may be more appropriate as it would make the proposals more deliverable.
- **CLH2 - To allocate land for a cemetery and associated buildings:** It is not clear in this policy that the developers of Site G will be expected to deliver the cemetery. This requirement needs to be clearly embedded into the policy text. The red-line needs to include the access road. The key should be amended to say 'Indicative access road alignment' instead of road. Paragraph 8.4 is unnecessary as the cemetery will require planning permission in any event. The title should be changed to 'Allocate land for a cemetery.'
- **CLH5 – Provision of play provision for new developments:** Whilst it is normal to require financial contributions from developers for off-site provision, it is not normal to require them to provide land as this may not be under their control. Does this policy add to what is already set out at a higher level?
- **CLH6 – To allocate land for allotments:** The title should be changed to 'Allocate land for allotments'
- **CLH7 – Provision of new health facilities:** This policy does not do very much (in the same way that our policy for Chalfont St Peter did not do much), however it does give a positive message of support. We suggest changing the title to 'Protection of existing and provision of new health facilities'
- **CHL8 – Conservation of Hospital Site:** The wording of this policy is prohibitive and therefore contrary to guidance on how policies should be written. If, for example, the NHS wanted to build a new hospital with better facilities on a different site, the hospital site could not be developed for any other use and could not therefore cross-fund the

new development. We suggest that support for the hospital is already provided in CLH7 and this policy should be removed.

- **CLH9 – Protection of Existing Green Open Space:** This is an appropriate policy for a Neighbourhood Plan. The spaces allocated have been checked against the requirements for local green space as stated in the NPPF. The sentence 'The following sites have been agreed to be protected...' needs to be reworded along the lines of 'The following sites are designated as Local Green space:'. The map on P46 needs to be made clearer. The green spaces need to be clearly labelled as 'Proposed Local Green Spaces'.
- **CLH11 – Preservation of St. Rumbold's Well:** St Rumbold's Well should be identified as a Scheduled Ancient Monument. The site should be shown on a map along with the locations of Site G+J. It needs to be made clear who is expected to deliver this – the developers?
- **CLH12 – Creation of new parks and Green Spaces:** Avoid the term 'publically accessible open space' – what you want is 'public open space. Last sentence not clear – does this policy only apply to windfall sites and employment areas, or to all development sites?
- **CLH13 – Continuation and expansion of Riverside Walk:** Saved Policy BULL 11 already requires of sites adjacent to the River to secure public access to the river, including the site shown in the document. Is there anything additional you wish to add to this policy? For example should buildings be designed to overlook the footpath? Spell out exactly what you want this policy to do so that it can replace Saved Policy BULL 11.
- Is the Green space shown on Fig 8.6.intended to be one of the Local Green Spaces? If so it needs to be included in Policy CLH 12 and tested against the criteria set out in the NPPF.

2.8 Economy and Education Policies

Our primary concerns with this chapter are the legitimacy of the protection of land for a bypass and the strength of the connection between the expansion of the University and the delivery of student housing. Other concerns are more general and relate to wording and the repetition of policies from other neighbourhood plans. We make the following comments and suggestions:

- **EE1 – Protection of routes for an A421:** Whilst you have indicated that this is an aspiration and not a policy, it is presented as a policy and reads like one. This is a risky policy and is very unlikely to pass examination for the following reasons:
 - There is no evidence base to suggest that a bypass is necessary.
 - A majority of the route indicated for the bypass lies outwith the boundary of the plan – it is not possible to set policy requirements for land outside your designated area.
 - If the policy becomes simply an aspiration, it is likely that the Examiner will wish to broaden the Referendum Area to include those people potentially affected by this aspiration. Depending on your relationships with adjoining parishes and their views on the ring road , this may open up risks.
 - Aspiring to a bypass may have unintended consequences that will jeopardise other aspirations of a plan. For example, for a developer fund a bypass it is

realistic to expect the delivery of around 2000 houses. This would significantly alter the character of the town.

- We recommend the removal of this policy from the plan.
- It is understood that there may be some potential to deliver the bypass as part of a larger national scheme extending an existing route from Oxford. The Plan could state that it will monitor the progress of this potential extension and work with relevant agencies to ensure that any potential bypass delivers the best possible outcome for Buckingham.
- **EE2 – Allocation of land for employment development:** This policy should be retitled 'Allocate land for employment development.' It is not clear how and when it would become appropriate to release Site C for development. Who would review this?
 - In the 4th bullet point what is meant by 'excessive enclosure'?
 - In 9.2 – it would be far more desirable to run the proposed rural footpath along the front of the existing houses along the western edge of the employment area. Paths located to the rear of buildings can feel unsafe and create opportunities for break-ins via back gardens.
- **EE9 - Land allocated to University of Buckingham expansion:** Aside from the issue of whether this policy is enforceable (see comments on HP2 above), this policy needs to be more clearly linked to Policy HP2. Para 9.21 is unclear. Does student housing have to be delivered in parallel to new development or before new development can occur? The policy text itself does not make sense: something along the following lines would work better 'Development of new and the refurbishment of existing academic buildings for university use on the sites shown in Figure 9.9 will be supported. New development must include the provision of new student accommodation commensurate with the scale of the development at the same time.'

2.9 Infrastructure

Most of the comments in this chapter relate to minor changes and wording. We make the following comments and suggestions:

- **I1 – Integration of new development into the existing town:** The sentence beginning 'Any new development....proposed traffic flows' is common sense and would be naturally considered as a normal part of any new development. Para 10.1 does not clearly spell out what the Town Council wants it to achieve. This is that all roads with potential for on-street parking should be wide enough to also accommodate the movements of service vehicles. This should be re-worded. Again as this is not stated in the policy text it is not enforceable – it needs to be included in the policy.
- **I2 – Creation of green infrastructure networks into new development:** Does this policy really mean 'green' infrastructure or simply 'infrastructure'? Some sites will be within urban locations and unlikely to be part of the green network.
- **15 – Sustainable Building Design:** The sentence 'New homes....affordable housing' is confusing as it is not clear whether it is referring to all new homes or only affordable. This should be re-phrased.
- **16 Renewable energy generation:** The last sentence doesn't make sense.

- **110- Sewage Management.** The requirement to provide a foul drainage plan at occupation stage is too late. The Plan should be submitted with the planning application and implemented prior to occupation.

2.10 Financial uplift

Financial Uplift is odd title for this chapter and we question why this has been chosen? It would be cleared to call it 'Infrastructure requirements' or 'Developer Contributions'. Our major concern in this chapter, as in previous sections, relates to the references to the bypass.

- **FU1 – Contributions towards an A421 relief road and a western bypass for the town.** You cannot ask for financial contributions from new development towards a bypass (or even a feasibility study) as there is no evidence to suggest that new development will make a bypass necessary.

2.11 Design and Access Statements

This section is reproduced verbatim from the Thame Neighbourhood Plan. Aside from the issue of copyright infringement, we are concerned that this chapter does not relate to specific issues you have in Buckingham.

If you wish to retain this chapter in the Plan, then (i) permission needs to be sought from Tibbalds to use the text; and (ii) the formatting of the text needs to be clear about what is policy and what isn't.

However, you should note that the legislation governing Design and Access Statements was updated in June 2013 (after Thame passed referendum). The new legislation states that Design and Access Statements are only required for Major Developments (buildings more than 1,000 square metres, and developments of 10 dwellings or more) or certain types of development on designated sites. Therefore other types of development will not have to provide a DAS.

2.12 Site Specific Requirements

This chapter is confusing as the way in which the text is laid out is different from the bulk of the document. It is not clear what is policy and what is not. It is hard to read the location plans and the text for each site together and to determine where the description of one site needs and another starts. It would be better to give each site its own page(s) with larger scale plans that were easy to read and clearly related to the text.

The section would benefit greatly from some simple strategy diagrams that illustrate the design principles being put forward. Examples of these can be seen in the Thame Neighbourhood Plan. As noted in our discussion, these plans setting out built area of development, green space and access requirements in the Thame Neighbourhood Plan are NOT indicative: they set out clear policy parameters (although the developers at the Examination tried to assert that they were). These plans have already been tested through the Development Management process, with developers of Site C being required to draw back from developing within the area designated as publicly accessible open space during pre-application discussions. If you wish to include similar plans in your Neighbourhood Plan, then that is perfectly acceptable. However, it is important to note that – although they appear simple – the Thame plans are informed by a thorough understanding of issues such as visual impact and landscape.

The main issue with this section is that the explanatory principles set out for each site are not embedded in the policy and are therefore weak. In the Thame Plan, principles are set

out at a high level within policy text and then a connection is made between the supporting text's detailed principles by stating at the end of each policy that design brief for each site must include all of the detailed design principles set out in the explanatory text.

As discussed at the meeting the sites should be re-named to match the site assessment document or vice versa to make cross referral easier.

There are some instances where the policy text needs to be more specific. These are:

- 13.25 This needs to state where green space should go not just suggest the benefits of a certain location
- 13.34 This states that 'Up to 28 dwellings and a *slat* for visitors,' – what does this mean?
- 13.42 Site M is required to provide 12ha of sports facilities. Does this mean sports pitches? If so specify.

3 Sustainability Appraisal

We have not reviewed the content of the SA in a great deal of detail and have instead focussed on the procedural issues. The key points are:

- Overall, the SA seems to have followed the proper procedures. However, an explanation / reference to the Scoping stage is needed in order to explain whether consultees raised any issues and – if so – how the SA has responded to them. Appendix A (the Scoping Report) is not included in our copy of the document.
- The introductory text needs to be clearer that this SA incorporates the requirements of SEA. This is a critical technical point in terms of Examination. Suggest the following wording (there is no problem taking *small* amounts of text from Thame!) "Strategic Environmental Assessment is a requirement of the EC Directive on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment (Directive 2001/42/EC) known as the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive. This is transposed into UK law through the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 which applies to plans with significant environmental effects (SEA Regulations). Throughout this document where sustainability appraisal is referred to the requirements of SEA Directive have been incorporated."
- It is not clear where the objectives in Table 2a have come from – add in some explanatory text.
- It would be helpful to have a clearer narrative explaining how the testing of the individual sites led to the final plan. How were decisions made? Why this final plan?
- The tables assessing the NP policies against the objectives will need to be revised once the Plan is finalised for the Regulation 14 consultation. The SA should be consulted upon with the Neighbourhood Plan.

4 Consultation Statement

A Consultation Statement is only required when you submit the Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Planning Authority – i.e. after you have been through this Regulation 14 consultation and have amended the Plan in response to representations made. We therefore recommend that you save time and resources by only updating this Consultation Statement once the next round of consultation has been completed. In the meantime, we have the following comments:

- It is important to bear in mind that the Examiner may only read the Consultation Statement, and may not refer to other consultation documents that have preceded it. Whilst the Consultation Statement only provides an overview, it needs to be as complete as possible so that the Examiner can easily understand what consultation has taken place. There are key pieces of information missing from many areas of the plan – *when* things happened (e.g. para 2.7), *how many* responses were received (para 2.8), *what* the key issues were (para 2.24 – did the responses on the SA Scoping change or influence your approach?).
- It is helpful to keep the requirements of the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations in mind when structuring the Consultation Statement, in that it should contain:
 - details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
 - an explanation of how they were consulted;
 - a summary the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
 - describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.
- Be clear what sites you are referring to. Para 4.7 – not clear how the site between Tingewick Road and the A421 relates to both the Neighbourhood Plan and the Site Assessment Document.
- Para 4.13 is a bit vague – need a clearer link between what was said at consultation and what is in the Plan. It seems that an overview of feedback from all consultation events is provided in para 13.1 – if this is the case, a clearer structure would help highlight this section as important.
- Para 10.1 – who are the stakeholders as opposed to the public?
- Para 14.1 – what was the purpose of the old and new photos?
- Para 14.3 - What was the purpose of the 'bean poll'? How and why were the four questions selected?
- What was the purpose of the Development Vision Roadshow? Need to explain why developers were invited to promote sites that may or may not have ended up in the plan. Rather confusing as it stands.
- Para 17.9 '... the apparent absence from the Plan may be a disincentive to support for (sic) the Plan, as voters may not be aware of local or national policies'. This is not a good reason for repeating higher level policy.
- Need to include information from consultation events in an appendix to show what people were consulted upon, and how it was advertised.

5 Site Assessment Document

This is a thorough appraisal of potential development sites. However, it is very difficult to relate the sites in this document to those allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan. For example, which site (or sites) make up Reserve Housing Site M?

An overall plan showing all sites considered would help in understanding the geographical spread of the sites, and cross-referencing to the Neighbourhood Plan is needed.

6 Evidence Base Document

This is a well put together, clearly referenced document. However, it could be improved as follows:

- an index would make navigating the document much easier;
- we are not experts on HMOs – however, we cannot find the distinction between large and small HMOs referred to on Page 10. As indicated in the footnote, if more than 6 unrelated people occupy a building for residential purposes and share facilities, this is no longer an HMO but does not have a use class – i.e. is Sui Generis. The conclusions in this Evidence Base would seem to point to there not being scope for a policy requiring planning permission for conversion of a residential dwelling to an HMO, but this is not reflected in the Plan, which includes a policy. This is confusing;
- we are not experts on establishing housing numbers and – given the significance of allocating sites for development – it is likely that you will be challenged at both consultation and Examination on the number you have decided upon. However, you have built-in flexibility with a reserve site and this is crucial to defending your approach;
- page 17 – para 1.36 – we are not clear what is meant by ‘infrastructure’ in this context;
- page 47 onwards – this would benefit from a simple plan showing the location of the distinctive areas and some captioned photographs showing key buildings and spaces. Otherwise, this section is very hard for some one not familiar with Buckingham to understand.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARY & MUSEUM

November 21, 2014

Mr. Christopher Wayman, Town Clerk
Buckingham Town Council
Verney Close
Buckingham
MK18 1JP
UNITED KINGDOM

Dear Mr. Wayman:

The year 2015 marks the 150th anniversary of the death of Abraham Lincoln. In 1865, municipalities and organizations of all types around the world sent hundreds of letters of condolence to the United States, filled with outrage at the assassination and sympathy for the bereaved nation. I enclose a copy of just such a letter from your predecessor in 1865.

As part of the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library and Museum's remembrance of Abraham Lincoln's life and legacy on the anniversary of his death, we are seeking international reflections on what Abraham Lincoln has meant to the world over the past 150 years, and we would like a letter from you to pair with that of your predecessor. In what ways has the legacy of Abraham Lincoln affected leaders and citizens of your city? How have his words and actions inspired you and your fellow citizens? How has your city interacted with the legacy of Abraham Lincoln in the past century and a half?

Your written response, together with its counterpart from 1865, will become an exhibit in the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Museum, an online exhibit available to the world (www.citizenlincoln.org), a published volume of selected letters, and a permanent part of the collections of the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library and Museum.

Thank you for your assistance as we consider how the world has responded to the life of Abraham Lincoln, and I look forward to hearing from you. If you have questions, please contact me at 217-785-9130 or dstowell@papersofabrahamlincoln.org. Please send your letters to the address below by 26 January 2015.

Sincerely,

Dr. Daniel W. Stowell
Director, Center for Digital Initiatives

Enclosure

Extract from the Minutes
of a Meeting of the
Town Council of the
Borough of Buckingham
held on Monday the 1st day
of May 1865.

That this Council desires to express its deep feeling of abhorrence at the dreadful crime committed in America by the assassination of the President of the United States, and its sympathy with the People of America in the sad and mournful event; and at the same time to indulge the hope that the establishment of a lasting Peace throughout the entire Republic may not be jeopardized or delayed by the awful calamity.

Geo. Bloom

Lionel Beck

Town Clerk

From: karen phillips [karen.phillips30@hotmail.co.uk]
Sent: 11 December 2014 19:08
To: townclerk@buckingham-tc.gov.uk
Subject: Buckingham General Charities

Dear Mr. Wayman,

As you know Buckingham General Charities (BGC) has three nominative Trustees appointed by Buckingham Town Council (BTC) and currently they are Mrs. Geraldine Collins, Mr. Terry Bloomfield and Mr. Paul Hirons.

For various administrative reasons we have just elected Paul as a co-optative Trustee and consequently there is now a vacancy for a third nominative Trustee from the BTC. Would you be able to arrange for the appointment of a replacement Trustee?

Yours sincerely,

Karen Phillips

Aylesbury Vale Community Safety Partnership

NEWSLETTER

Issue (8) October 2014



As the Chair of the partnership I am delighted to send you the latest edition of our newsletter. I very much hope this will give you a helpful overview of the Community Safety Partnership's activities over the previous quarter along with what's planned for the next quarter.

The two priorities for 2014/15 are:

- Safe and secure town centres
- Dealing with the crimes that are most significant to victims and communities

I look forward to working with partners on these priorities.

Jon McGinty Aylesbury Vale Community Safety Partnership

Crime Figures

1st Apr 2014–30th September 2014	Offences	% Change from 2013/2014
Burglary	135	-9.40%
Theft from vehicles	308	-24.32%
Theft of vehicles	43	-29.51%
Robbery (business)	3	200%
Robbery (personal)	19	-9.52%
Serious acquisitive crime (crime types above)	508	-20.50%
Overall crime	3476	-16.38%
Total anti-social behaviour	1242	3.93%

Winter time burglary Operation Arctic



A wintertime burglary prevention campaign commenced in October in which supporting messages about making the home look occupied, leaving lights on and using timer switches will be key. As well as information about properly locking UPVC doors, vigilance, looking out for neighbours etc.

www.aylesburyvalcdc.gov.uk/community-living/

Domestic Abuse Awareness Events



This campaign has been led by the Police since March 2014. The aim is to raise the awareness of domestic abuse with various groups. In October an event was held at Aylesbury College, to give advice about support and services available to students that may be suffering from domestic abuse.

www.thamesvalleypolice.uk

Purple Flag

We submitted our Purple Flag reassessments for Aylesbury in September. This is a light touch renewal and allows us to demonstrate the ongoing activities of the partnership in keeping the town safe. A decision will be made in the Autumn.

www.atcm.org/programmes/purple_flag/

ASB Crime and Policing Act 2014

In October, the Government's new approach to Antisocial Behaviour, Crime and Policing, was implemented. This Act includes a complete overhaul of the powers to deal with anti-social behaviour, and two new processes to ensure agencies put the needs of victims first, these are:

Community Trigger

Gives victims and communities the right to request a review of their anti social behaviour case, if a locally derived threshold is met and where they believe there has been a lack of action. Activating the Trigger means that the CSP will review the events of the case and ask agencies to consider if any further action could be taken to resolve the problem.

Community Remedy

Gives victims a say about the out-of-court punishment of perpetrators of low-level crime and ASB, by being able to choose from a predetermined list of sanctions.

Hate Crime Week

We held a road show event in Friars Square during hate crime week in May, giving people information about what hate crime is and how to report it. We engaged with over 200 people during the event. More information can be found at:

www.victimsupport.org.uk

Shed Burglary

During April we ran the spring time campaign focusing attention on reducing risks of thefts from sheds and outbuildings. We ran 6 events in various garden centres in Aylesbury, Buckingham and Waddesdon, giving advice on security.

The campaign also highlighted the need to secure access to gardens to prevent easy access for burglars to the rear of properties, which is the most frequent access point. We engaged with over 400 people at these events and gave out a number of crime prevention products. Further info can be found at:

www.aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk/community-living/community-safety



Summertime Burglary

The annual summer burglary prevention campaign rolled out in June addressing the 2 seasonal risks of windows/doors being left open due to the warmer weather, and unattended homes whilst people are on holiday. The campaign called 'Don't get burnt by burglars this summer' involved the distribution of a pocket sized card giving preventative advice and handy holiday check list to help people secure their properties before going away. The cards were distributed to approximately 100 venues including travel agents, GP surgeries, animal kennels and pharmacies. PCSO's distributed them at various summer events and whilst out on patrol in high risk locations.

The campaign was publicised widely in the media, on TVP Thames Valley Alert system and to parish councils.

An electronic version of the card was also forwarded to all schools in the Vale for inclusion in their parents e-newsletter.



Operation Ranger

Operation Ranger is our approach to raising awareness of rural crime risks which ran throughout September. In addition to normal policing activities, the neighbourhood policing team carried out a series of visits to farms and properties in rural areas, and offered tack, tool and bike security marking at a series of crime prevention and reduction events. High visibility patrols and operational activities were also carried out to target known offenders.

During the week, there was an Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) operation and 57 pieces of high value property were protectively marked. The team also signed 92 people up to Thames Valley Alert.

Further information can be found at:
www.thamesvalleypolice.uk



Safeguarding

One of the CSP's targets is to improve the protection of vulnerable people by working with our partners to ensure that the people most at risk are identified and the risk is reduced. One area of safeguarding that has had a high media profile of late is that of child sexual exploitation (CSE). In order to raise awareness with young people and give them the tools to recognise this type of crime "Chelsea's Choice" has been rolled out in local schools for children 14+.

Chelsea's Choice is a powerful play created to show how young people, boys and girls, are groomed for purposes of sexual exploitation. The play has so far been rolled out to 9 of the 11 Buckinghamshire secondary schools.

www.alteregocreativesolutions.co.uk/chelseas-choice/

FIFA World Cup

During the world cup in June we worked with pub watch members and Thames Valley Police to increase awareness around hate crime, safe drinking and violent crime by a poster campaign. In conclusion the world cup 2014 saw a smaller increase in domestic violence reports with fewer incidents reported than in the last significant increase seen during the world cup 2010.

Sign up to AVDC Twitter page: #Aylesburyvale

Sign up to Thames Valley Police Twitter page: #ThamesVP

For more information on any of the information included in the newsletter call 01296 585061 or email communitysafety@aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk

Office@buckingham-tc.gov.uk

From: Craig Horn <craig.horn@maxema.co.uk>
Sent: 06 January 2015 09:48
To: tmills@aylesburyvaldc.gov.uk; disham710@gmail.com; office@buckingham-tc.gov.uk; john.bercow.mp@parliament.uk
Subject: VF 4176 - Pre-consultation - Buckingham Builders Merchant

Dear Sir / Madam,

Proposed Base Station Upgrade at: Buckingham Builders Merchants, Stratford Road, Buckingham, Buckinghamshire, MK18 1TD

Vodafone Limited has entered into an agreement with Telefonica UK Limited pursuant to which the two companies plan to jointly operate and manage a single network grid across the UK. These arrangements will be overseen by Cornerstone Telecommunications Infrastructure Ltd (CTIL) which is a joint venture company owned by Vodafone Limited and Telefonica UK Limited.

(This agreement allows both organisations to:

- Pool their basic network infrastructure, while running two, independent, nationwide networks
- Maximise opportunities to consolidate the number of base stations
- significantly reduce the environmental impact of network development

Vodafone and Telefonica are in the process of identifying a suitable site in the Buckingham area for a radio base station. The purpose of this letter is to consult with you and seek your views on our proposal before proceeding with the works. We understand that you are not always able to provide site specific comments, however, Vodafone and Telefonica are committed to consultation with communities for mobile telecommunications proposals and as such would encourage you to respond.

As part of Vodafone and Telefonica's continued network improvement program, there is a specific requirement for a radio base station at this location to improve coverage in the area.

Mobiles can only work with a network of base stations in place where people want to use their mobile phones or other wireless devices. Without base stations, the mobile phones and other devices we rely on simply won't work.

(Please find below the details of the proposed site and the alternative site options considered and discounted in our site selection process: -

Our technical network requirement is as follows:

- *Cell Site Ref – CTIL 108945 – VF 4176 – Buckingham Builders Merchants*
- *The site is required to improve the coverage in the area.*

A number of options have been assessed in respect of the site search process and we consider the best solution is as follows:

- Buckingham Builders Merchants, Stratford Road, Buckingham, Buckinghamshire, MK18 1TD - (NGR 469894, 234180)
- *This is the preferred option as the site provides adequate coverage, its proposed position is considered suitable in the context for the telecommunications base station. Taking into account the development's siting and appearance when read in its current environment, it is considered that a scheme in this location will not undermine the visual amenity of the area with minimal impact on the sky-line whilst utilising an existing structure.*

No alternative site options have been investigated as the works proposed are for an upgrade of an existing Vodafone site. The works will include the replacement / addition of antennas / dishes along with associated development. The upgrade of this site provides an opportunity to utilise the existing telecommunications site and show compliance with national (NPPF and Code of Best Practice on Mobile Phone Network Development) and local the Development Plan planning policies which all encourage the usage of existing structures.

The Local Planning Authority must register and our records of other potential sites have already been reviewed, the policies in the Development Plan have been taken into account and the planning history of the site has been examined.

All Vodafone and Telefonica installations are designed to be fully compliant with the public exposure guidelines established by the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP). These guidelines have the support of UK Government, the European Union and they also have the formal backing of the World Health Organisation.

We look forward to receiving any comments you may have on the proposal within 14 days of the date of this letter.

Yours faithfully,



Craig Horn
Maxema Ltd
mob: 07851 005034
email: craig.horn@maxema.co.uk
Unit 2 | Charnwood House | Marsh Road | Ashton | Bristol | BS3 2NA

(For and on behalf of CTIL, Vodafone Limited & Telefonica UK Limited)

The information contained in or attached to this email is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are not authorised to and must not disclose, copy, distribute, or retain this message or any part of it. It may contain information which is confidential and/or covered by legal professional or other privilege (or other rules or laws with similar effect in jurisdictions outside England and Wales).

The views expressed in this email are not necessarily the views of Maxema Ltd, and the company, its directors, officers or employees make no representation or accept any liability for its accuracy or completeness unless expressly stated to the contrary.



BUCKINGHAM ECONOMIC GROUP

Chairman: John Riches, 3 Sandhill Farm, Middle Claydon, Bucks MK18 2LD

☎ (H) 01296 730730 (M) 07930 608522 (E) richesjohn@hotmail.co.uk

Secretary: Mike Smith, 59 Deerfield Close, Buckingham MK18 7ET

☎ (H) 01280 822215 (M) 07717 377314 (E) mns47@tiscali.co.uk

**You are invited to attend the next BEG Meeting
to be held from 1830 hrs on Wednesday 14 January 2015 at
Buckingham Town Council Chamber
(adjacent to Cornwalls Meadow car park, opposite Waitrose)**

A G E N D A

- 1 Introductions & Apologies for Absence
- 2 Confirm Minutes of 6 August 2014 meeting (*further copy attached*)
- 3 Wash-up of Open Meeting with Daniel Mouawad (SEMLEP) on 12 November 2014
- 4 Any Matters Arising not covered below
- 5 **Future & Direction of BEG:**
 - 5.1 To determine whether or not BEG still has a value in promoting economic development in Buckingham and, if so, how best the Group might proceed in the future
- 6 **District & County updates:**
 - 6.1 SEMLEP, Bucks & TV LEP & LEADER updates
 - 6.2 BBF etc initiatives for Buckingham
 - 6.3 Unemployment & vacancy figures update
- 7 **Other Business**
- 8 **Future meetings:**
 - 7.1 Depending on outcome of discussion at 5 above, to agree the sequence of future meeting dates (actual dates will be dependent on venue availability)

Circulation

Philippa Batting

Mal Hussain

John Riches (Chair)

Rupert Waters

Mena Caldbeck

Derrick Isham

Jim Sims

Town Clerk (for info)

Paddy Collins

Steve McAteer

Mike Smith

Jon Harvey

Pat Ogden

Elliot Wallis

BUCKINGHAM ECONOMIC GROUP

Minutes of the Buckingham Economic Group Meeting held on 6 August 2014

In Attendance: Philippa Batting (BBF) Mena Caldbeck (AVDC)
Derrick Isham (BTC) Pat Ogden (TSE)
John Riches (BBC & Chairman) Mike Smith (BTC & Secretary)

Apologies: Jon Harvey (BTC) Rupert Waters (BBF)

1 **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

- 1.1 The Minutes of the previous meeting, held on 14 May 2014, were approved. There were no Matters Arising.

2 **LOCAL ISSUES**

- 2.1 **Destination Buckingham** – MS provided the following update:

- 2.1.1 column-mounted banner flags at the entrance to the shopping area from Cornwalls Meadow car park (instead of the previously suggested decorative arch or sculptures) were still in hand;
- 2.1.2 the **Civic Day** on 21 June 2014, spearheaded by Buckingham Society and Buckingham Rotary, had been a great success;
- 2.1.3 the **Bikeingham** cycling event on 27 July had also been a success, with around 200 people taking part in the three main events. The cyclo-cross races had been organised by Bicester's Millennium Cycling Club, and *Team Extreme* had provided "thrills and spills" with BMX bikes on the Skate Park, and had coached would-be trick-cycling youngsters. About 70 route maps had been issued for the Family Fun Ride around the Circular Walk, and TVP had security marked close on 50 bicycles. The event had been supported by local traders, had been positively promoted and reported in the *Buckingham & Winslow Advertiser*, and would probably become an annual event
- 2.1.4 work to update the www.buckinghamuk.info website was still in hand; and JR and MS were awaiting a Buckingham-centred article to appear in *Business MK*.

2.2 **Shop Buckingham**

- 2.2.1 In the absence of anyone from the Traders' Association, no report was received. MS said that he understood that the annual Shopping Spectacular would this year be on the same day as the Christmas Lights switch-on (29 November).
- 2.2.2 JR said that there was anecdotal evidence to suggest that Waitrose were concerned about the impact of the planned new Sainsbury and Aldi stores on the edge of town (it was too early to say if the recently opened Sainsbury Local at Chandos Road was affecting town centre trade).

2.3 **Tourist Information Centre**

- 2.3.1 PO said that there had been a considerable number of visitors from overseas (Europe and Australia), including coach visits by overseas students. The GP weekend at Silverstone, and their F1 and Classic events, had all increased town footfall. Visitor Information Centre numbers for the calendar year to date (January to July) totalled 17,519 (16,058 for the same period in 2013).
- 2.3.2 Ticket sales for local events, including the Buckingham Fringe, Buckingham Summer Festival and the forthcoming Bucks County Show, had been and remained buoyant. The Visitor Information Centre would open again on August Bank Holiday Monday.

BUCKINGHAM ECONOMIC GROUP

2.3.3 MS reported the following comparative costs etc:

	TIC Cost	Apr 2013 – Mar 2014		Apr 2014 – Jun 2014	
		Visitor Numbers	Cost per visitor	Visitor Numbers	Cost per visitor
Aylesbury TIC	£63,500.00	19,093	£3.33	3,551	£4.47
Buckingham TIC	£25,000.00	57,031	£0.44	8,022	£0.78

2.3.4 He added that, although these figures indicated that AVDC invested more than two and a half times more than BTC to deal with about a third of the visitor numbers, this had to be seen in the context of siting problems in Aylesbury, and the significant footfall reduction arising from National Trust disinvestment in the site. A move to new premises in Aylesbury is anticipated in the next few months, which should significantly improve their figures. It also seemed likely that AVDC investment in tourism (totalling £79,600.00 in 2014/15) would be severely reduced in coming years.

2.4 **Buckingham Business Club** – JR said BBC Committee was currently addressing the current low membership and the declining numbers attending Network Lunches. This may lead to a re-launch of the Club via the Business MK newspaper. It was suggested that if Bucks Fizz was experiencing similar difficulties, it may point to changing demographics, although MC noted that all Aylesbury Business Clubs seemed well supported.

3 DISTRICT & COUNTY ISSUES

3.1 SEMLEP

3.1.1 MC updated the meeting on recent and planned activities. She reported that the Driving Technological Change event at Silverstone had seen 300 attending from the six LEP area, 174 of whom were engineers; but only two Vale businesses had been there.

3.1.2 The local growth fund stood at £64m; UKCI was aimed at the Chinese market; the “Going for Gold” portal to promote apprenticeships and associated vacancies would launch in October; and the High Performance Technology Group was mapping a supply chain for motor sport. There was a brief discussion about the focus for such groups, including a perception that UTCs were taking pupils that impacted on school pupil budgets.

3.2 BTVLEP

3.2.1 PB said that Buckinghamshire will receive £44.2m from the Government’s Local Growth Fund, with £8.9m of new funding for 2015/16.

3.2.2 Agreement between AVDC and BCC provided for the transport bid to be applied for by BTVLEP rather than split with SEMLEP to ensure a co-ordinated bid. This included for improved cycle links between Buckingham and the planned Winslow rail station, and further road improvements that would inevitably benefit North Bucks as a whole.

3.2.3 PB added that bids for 2016/17 and 2017/18 could build on a “local flavour”, and members wondered if this might also include Buckingham by-pass re-routing to the south, as per the BNDP.

3.2.4 BBF could provide a variety of grants to assist businesses, including match-funded Velocity Grants, for small and medium businesses to create and safeguard jobs; grants for Sustainable Transport; Economic Innovation grants, to change the way things were done; and grants of up to £15,000.00 towards creating low-carbon workspaces.

3.3 Unemployment and Vacancies

3.3.1 Buckinghamshire’s claimant count in June 2014 had fallen by 239 to 3,168 (1.1% of working age residents) - the lowest since October 2008, matching levels seen in August 2002, June 2004, and April 2006. At 730, the number of claimants aged 18 – 24 was also at its lowest since October 2008, accounting for 20.2% of the total (the lowest share since December 2005).

BUCKINGHAM ECONOMIC GROUP

- 3.3.2 Also in June, there were 5,154 job openings, which was an increase from the 3,165 recorded in the same month last year. The most commonly advertised jobs were for programmers and software development professionals (111), nurses (110), IT analysts (103), and primary and nursery school teachers.

3.4 Commuting Patterns

- 3.4.1 Rupert Waters had provided the following data about where the 7,540 Buckingham residents worked in 2011 (**Note** – *Buckingham here refers to the wards of Buckingham North, Buckingham South and Luffield Abbey*):

Residents working in:	Number	Percentage
Buckingham	2,892	38.4%
Aylesbury	467	6.2%
Rest of Aylesbury Vale	597	7.9%
Central Milton Keynes	292	3.9%
Rest of Milton Keynes	828	11.0%
Rest of Buckinghamshire	187	2.5%
Rest of SEMLEP	926	12.3%
London	240	3.2%
Elsewhere	1,111	14.6%

- 3.4.2 Of the 5,975 who did not work from home, 4,405 (73.7%) drove to work, with a further 283 (4.7%) travelling as passengers. 774 (13%) walked to work (the second most common mode of travel). Buckingham residents were more likely to travel by car than those in the county overall, and were much less likely to use buses or trains which account for 10.1% of county commutes but only 5.7% in Buckingham.
- 3.4.3 After Aylesbury Vale, MK was the most common LA area for Buckingham residents to work. While 1,120 Buckingham residents worked in MK, 730 MK residents worked in Buckingham. The next most common LA areas for Buckingham residents to work were Cherwell and South Northants, followed by Oxford, Central Bedfordshire and Wycombe.
- 3.4.4 There were 6,423 people employed in Buckingham in 2001, so while the town population rose 2.7% from 14,694 to 15,092, the number of people working in the town fell by 0.8%.

4 NEXT MEETING

- 4.1 As agreed previously, the next meeting would be held on **Wednesday 12 November**.
- 4.2 Although the Town Council Chamber had been booked, MS wondered whether an alternative venue and a wider invited audience may be preferable given that the SEMLEP Chief Executive, Daniel Mouawad, had agreed to attend. It was agreed that JR would seek alternative venues, bearing in mind that the BEG had no funds; and that all members suggest potential invitees to MS by the end of August.
- 4.3 It was also agreed to dispense with the formal business to allow concentration on Daniel's inputs and any ensuing discussion.

Aylesbury Vale Transport Users' Group

Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting held at 2pm on Tuesday 2 December 2014 in the Methodist Church Community Centre, Buckingham Street, Aylesbury.

1: Apologies and attendance.

Apologies

BCC Cllr Carl Etholen, Paul Morgan (Arriva), Mrs Iris Smith (No 8 bus user), Ms Sarah James (Aylesbury), BCC Cllr Angela Macpherson, BCC Cllr John Chilver, AVDC Cllr Susan Renshall, Susan White (Boarstall PC), BCC Cllr. Brian Adams, Jenny Woodey, AVDC Cllr David Vick, .

Present

Colin Higgs (chair), Colin Richardson (Vice-chair), Peter Gulland (Haddenham user), Diana Gulland (Haddenham user), Félim Doyle (Aylesbury & Stoke Mandeville user), Ken Harris (Swanbourne user), Geoff Aldridge (Wingrave), Graham Aylett (Aylesbury Old town Residents Association), Trish Cawte (Winslow TC), Jon Harvey (Buckingham TC), Rachel Webb (AVALC), Elisabeth Bendall (Tring Bus Users Group), Andy Clarke (BCC – Transport for Bucks.), Janet Gowin (North Marston user), Anthony Bassett (High Wycombe user), David Coleman (Arriva), David Horsler (Transport for Buckinghamshire), Jill Greenfield (Aylesbury user), Alan Creek (Aylesbury user), BCC Cllr. Andy Huxley, E.R. Kendrick (Aylesbury user), Bronwen Lee (Aylesbury user), Ian Malcolm (Whitchurch), Paul Young (North Marston), John Elvin (Chiltern Line Users Association), Arthur Evans (Quainton PC), Corry Cashman (AVDC).

2: Items for inclusion under Any Other Business (AOB)

There were none.

3: Minutes of previous meeting on 9 September 2014, and matters arising.

There were no matters arising.

The minutes were agreed and signed.

4: Committee Update

Proposed X444 limited stop coach service between High Wycombe and Northampton.
John Harvey made the following points:

- Educational institutions were generally supportive.
- Stagecoach and Arriva bus companies had been asked for their support.
- A petition supporting the proposal was available online at <https://democracy.buckscc.gov.uk/documents/s49187/Petitions%20Protocol.pdf>
(To run from 12 January 2015 for 28 days).

5: Bus matters

X60 route Aylesbury – Winslow – Buckingham – Milton Keynes.

- The new X60 service had produced a 10% increase in passengers between Aylesbury and Milton Keynes. The numbers using route 60 is low.
- Arriva was addressing overcrowding at the Milton Keynes end of the route.
- Keeping within drivers' legal hours prevents the service stopping at Morrisons and the station in Aylesbury.
- The demand for an evening and Sunday service is being monitored.
- New bus stops on the A413 near Swanbourne were not possible on cost and safety grounds.
- Dave Chapman of Arriva will remind drivers to make sure there is no one waiting at bus stops before they drive past. Stops in Exchange Street Aylesbury were not always easy to see because of parked theatre coaches.
- The hedge on the road between North Marston and Oving is still overgrown. Rachel Webb will pursue this through the local area forum (LAF).

Route 9 Aylesbury - Walton Court – Stoke Mandeville Hospital

- There was a problem with some no. 9 buses missing passengers at Stoke Mandeville Hospital bus stop

Route 150 Aylesbury - Leighton Buzzard - Milton Keynes

- There is still no evening service.
- Double decker buses going via Springfield road in Leighton Buzzard could help alleviate the overcrowding problem.
- The new route F70 Luton – Dunstable - Leighton Buzzard - Milton Keynes had helped to reduce pressure on the Leighton Buzzard - Milton Keynes section of this route.

Route 280: Aylesbury - Haddenham - Thame - Oxford

- No work has yet been done on the closed section of the bus lane between Thornhill and Headington Roundabout. Andy Clarke to investigate.

Route 61: Aylesbury – Ivinghoe – Dunstable - Luton

- The 6:23 a.m. Service does not go to Luton station but stops at Luton Church Street. This is because of timetable constraints.
- Travellers to Luton airport using this route now have the option of travelling on the frequent Dunstable to Luton airport service which they can join at Dunstable. Check timetables beforehand.

Route 501 Aylesbury – Tring - Hemel Hempstead - Watford

- Herts county council is consulting on proposals which could reduce this service in the evening and on Sundays.

Route 50: The Horwoods – Winslow – Milton Keynes

- Andy Clarke to investigate whether the timetable for passengers travelling to, and shopping in, Winslow could be more customer friendly.

Next bus service review.

- This would cover the Wing Ivinghoe and Cheddington area and would probably be in July 2015. Andy Clarke to find out when the next Stewkley service review was to take place.

Livery.

- Buses painted with particular route numbers are sometimes changed to another route at short notice when a shortage of buses occurs on that route. While confusing, it is unavoidable.

Quarrendon.

- The considerable number of buses presently serving Quarrendon did so because of the “free market” and “deregulation”.

Bedgrove.

- Bedgrove’s evening services were discontinued some years ago because of low usage.

Request stops.

- Most bus stops are request stops. Please signal clearly to the driver to stop.

Computer “Realtime” signs at bus stops.

- When only the scheduled time of the bus is shown it usually means that the satellite signal has been lost and that no real time information can be provided. In such situations no information on late running or replacement buses can be shown.

Monitoring of air quality Aylesbury bus station.

- Graham Aylett of Aylesbury Old Town Residents Association is pursuing this with the health and safety executive. Rachel Webb will pursue this in tandem with her health and safety contact.

Travel advice for people with hospital appointments.

- Such advice could easily be printed on the back of the appointment letters. Previous attempts to get this done have ended in failure. The minutes secretary was asked to write to Stoke Mandeville Hospital asking what advice is presently given and through what channels.

Out of date time tables.

- Andy Clarke to check on those still on display at Aylesbury bus station.

6: Rail matters

Chiltern Railways Leaf fall timetable

- This will continue to operate until Christmas. This means that trains will leave 3 minutes prior to advertised time.

Christmas Timetables

- Chiltern Railways
- There will be no Chiltern line trains on Christmas day, 25th December. Some Chiltern trains will operate on Boxing Day, 26th December between London Marylebone and Bicester North. They will run between 8 a.m. and 9:30 p.m. Check timetables before travelling.
- London Midland Trains
- There will be no London Midland trains on 25th and 26th December. On 27th and 28th December a bus and tube replacement service will run between Hemel Hempstead and London Euston.

Platforms 5 and 6 at Marylebone station.

- Trains from Bicester and Haddenham usually arrive at platforms 5 and 6 in Marylebone station. There is quite a long walk from there to the concourse. If there is a train already standing on either of these platforms then the walk to the concourse is even longer. Can Chiltern Railways be approached with a view to sharing this "pain" more evenly between the various routes?
The minutes secretary was asked to write Chiltern Railways

7: Meetings Calendar for the next twelve months.

The following dates were all agreed:

Wednesday 11 March 2015 at 2.00p.m.

Venue: Buckingham Community Centre (small hall), central Buckingham, beside Waitrose.

PLEASE NOTE: THIS MEETING IS ON A WEDNESDAY

Tuesday 2 June 2015 at 2.00 p.m.

Venue : Rooms 4 and 5, Aylesbury Methodist Church Community Centre, Buckingham Street, Aylesbury.

Tuesday 8th September 2015 at 2.pm.

Venue: Buckingham Community Centre (large hall), central Buckingham, near Waitrose.

Tuesday 1 December 2015 at 2.00 p.m.

Venue : Rooms 4 and 5, Aylesbury Methodist Church Community Centre, Buckingham Street, Aylesbury.

8: AOB

There was none

9: Date of Next Meeting

Wednesday 11 March 2015 at 2.00p.m.

Venue: Buckingham Community Centre (small hall), central Buckingham, beside Waitrose.

PLEASE NOTE: THIS MEETING IS ON A **WEDNESDAY**

Corry Cashman.

Minutes Secretary

c.cashman@zen.co.uk

Tel: 01296 668565

15 December 2014

Buckingham Community Centre

Minutes of the Management Committee Meeting held on 22 May 2014

Committee Members Present: Geraldine Collin, Paddy Collins, Roger Tear, Martin Try, Derrick Isham, Andy Mahi and Booking Manager Terry Bloomfield.

1. Apologies: Anne Liverseidge, Mike Hall and Peter Burke.

2. Minutes of 27 March 2014: Agreed as a true record.

3. Matters arising from said Minutes:

The PRS and PPL licences have been paid for 2014. £1546.51.

4. Correspondence: Two quotations received for the Dry cleaning of the Centre's curtains. Stratfords quoted £521.69, Willowspring quoted £536.40. Members elected to accept Stratfords Quotation.

5. Chairman's Report: Items on the Agenda.

6. Hot water taps in Toilets: The Chairman brought to the Committee's attention the water from the hot water taps in the Toilets was extremely hot; notices have been placed to warn users. It was agreed by members to contact British Gas and request an engineer visit the Centre to check out the gas boiler.

7. Booking Manager's Report:

Bookings for 2014 are healthy. We have secured at least a one year booking with H.M.R.C. This consists of a weekly booking on a Monday for the general public by appointment to visit the Centre to discuss their personal or business taxation with a representative of H.M.R.C.

8. Treasurers Report:

Paddy informed members that although we have lost the Tumble Tots hiring there was no revenue issues. The C.I.O. was on track, still awaiting response from Solicitor for signing. Paddy to chase up. It was agreed at the suggestion of the Treasurer that there would be no increase in hiring fees for 2015. Caretaker pay to stay £1 above the minimum wage. The recently employed two part-time caretakers have fitted into their caretaking roles very well.

9. Items for Future Agenda: Request quotations for replacement of the Centre's gas boilers.

10. Any Other Business: Contact Ceroc (Monday night hirer) concerning emergency exit doors in the Granville hall. Doors need to be hooked securely back if opened and ensure no items of equipment are blocking the doorway. This applies to all hirers.

11. Date of next Meeting: 24th July 2014 at 7.30pm. Any item of importance arising before the next meeting will be dealt with by the Chairman or an extraordinary meeting call by her.

Buckingham Community Centre

Minutes of the Management Committee Meeting held on 9 October 2014

Committee Members Present: Geraldine Collins, Paddy Collins, Roger Tear, Martin Try, Andy Mahi Anne Liverseidge, Mike Hall and Building / Booking Manager Terry Bloomfield.

- 1. Apologies:** Peter Burke.
- 2. Minutes of 22 May 2014:** Agreed as a true record.
- 3. Matters arising from said Minutes:** Centre Curtains have been cleaned; Temperature on hot water taps has been regulated.
- 4. Correspondence:** Letter received from Bucks Health Care requesting that the Community Centre be utilised has a temporary refuge in case of an emergency evacuation of Buckingham Hospital. Members agreed to the request with a proviso that if any hiring was interrupted or cancelled Bucks Health care would compensate the hirer or the Community Centre. Paddy to respond to the email accordingly.
- 5. Chairman's Report:** The Chairman wished to thank the Treasurer for his diligent work on the lease between the Town council and the new charity Buckingham Community Hall Association.
- 6. Booking Manager's Report:**

Bookings for 2015 are taking shape with all current hirers signing on for 2015. HMRC have booked every Monday morning this year, and until the end of March 2015. There is every likelihood this will continue for a further 12 months.
- 7. Treasurers Report:**

The intention is to switch all bookings and contracts to the new charity from 1st Jan 2015. This will also involve the TUPE'ing of the staff to the new charity. Agreed that legal advice would be sought as to the correct procedure to follow. The existing charity will pick up Chandler Ray's fees for acting for us as regards the new lease.
- 8. Hiring Rates:** The Treasurer recommended to Committee to keep hiring rates for 2015 the same as this year. Members supported the recommendation.
- 9. Wage Rate:** The norm of the Association is to keep hourly wage rate £1 above the minimum wage. Members agreed to raise Caretaker / cleaner wages to £7.50 per hour from the 1st January 2015. Members also agreed to renew the Building/ Booking office manager from the 1st November 2014. It was agreed with an Hourly rate of £14 per hour. Members agreed to £100 to the Treasurer to cover expenses he has incurred.
- 10. Automatic Enrolment in Pension (Government Regulations).** The Treasurer to look further into this regulation which will commence in April 2016, and report back.
- 11. Items for Future Agenda:** Request quotations for replacement of the Centre's gas boilers.
- 12. Any Other Business:** Craft Fairs to continue through 2015
- 13. Date of next Meeting:** 27th November 2014 at 7.30pm. Any item of importance arising before the next meeting will be dealt with by the Chairman or at an extraordinary meeting call by her.

BUCKINGHAM & MAIDS MORETON NEIGHBOURHOOD ACTION GROUP

NOTE OF THE ANNUAL PUBLIC MEETING HELD AT BUCKINGHAM COMMUNITY CENTRE ON WEDNESDAY 26 NOVEMBER 2014

In attendance:

Ms K Aitken	Ms G Bannerman	Ms J Barker	Cllr T Bloomfield
Mr D Child	Mrs G Child	Mrs D Clements	Sgt E Dover
Mrs M Howard	Ms J Jones	Mr D Lehman	Mrs M Lehman
Cllr T Mills	Ms S Monro	Mrs C Moxon	Mrs K Robins
Mr N Robinson	Mrs V Rodwell	Cllr M Smith (Chairman)	
PC N Tipping	Ms M van Hoecke	Mr J White	Cllr W Whyte

Apologies for Absence:

None

Welcome and Introduction

- 1.1 Cllr Smith welcomed everyone to the meeting, particularly Sgt Emily Dover from TVP and Ms Kay Aitken from AVDC Community Safety Team. He mentioned that Dawn Cotter would probably replace Alan Garside on the latter as he had recently moved on to pastures new.
- 1.2 He reminded everyone that NAGs, as the TVP website link said, were a key part of Neighbourhood Policing. Paraphrasing from the Constitution, he said that a NAG *is a problem-solving group of relevant partner agencies, key stakeholders and members of the community, each bringing different skills to resolving the identified priorities. By focussing on those concerns, community safety can be improved, and crime and disorder reduced.*
- 1.3 He explained that there was no paperwork this year, although he would gladly email a copy of the Minutes of last year's meeting to anyone who had not already received it. The meeting, which should take no more than about an hour, would summarise NAG activities in the preceding year, hear from TVP, and then discuss what NAG priorities would be for the coming year. Finally, after deciding who would be NAG Chairman for the coming year, there would be an opportunity for networking, discussing issues with TVP and/or AVDC Community Safety, collect leaflets etc kindly provided by PC Tipping – and hopefully volunteer for the several vacancies that the NAG currently had.

Review of the Year's Activities

- 2.1 Cllr Smith said that the NAG had met but NAG members had also been very active between meetings on a number of issues. The priorities decided upon last year were **noise** (particularly from pubs late at night) and associated ASB, **speeding** in specific areas of the town, **HGVs** trying to route through the old town and conservation area, and **litter and fly-tipping**.
- 2.2 **Noise** - following AVDC Environmental Health issuing Noise Abatement Notices to *13 High Street* and *The New Inn*, the problem was drastically reduced although, in July, it was noted that *The Kings Head* was now the noisiest pub in town, often until about 0030 hrs. In October, however, complaints about 13 High Street were again received about noise until as late as 0300 hrs.
- 2.3 There had been no complaints received about ASB associated with late-night drinking.
- 2.4 Connected with this, AVDC were reviewing their licensing policy, including a proposal to restrict late-night closure to 1.30am (midnight for new applicants unless extra tests for later closing were satisfied). This follows earlier sound measurement exercises undertaken in conjunction with the NAG, following its discussions with the Environmental Health and Licensing Departments about better controlling town centre late night noise. Public consultation on the revised Licensing Policy is expected early in the New Year.

BUCKINGHAM & MAIDS MORETON NEIGHBOURHOOD ACTION GROUP

- 2.5 **Speeding** - following last year's Annual Public Meeting, TVP conducted speed enforcement operations in various areas around the town; and County Councillor Warren Whyte arranged for speed tubes to be installed in the "hot spots". The speed tubes revealed average speeds (inbound and outbound) of 31.9 mph in Brackley Road, 24.15 mph in West Street, and 27.25 mph in Stratford Road. This suggested that traffic speeds were perceived to be higher than they actually were.
- 2.6 Thanks to Local Area Forum funding, Buckingham Town Council obtained a Motor Vehicle Activated Sign (MVAS) which could be used at those hot-spots where there was a sufficient view of oncoming traffic to register its speed. These remain in use, but unfortunately not in West Street which has proved unsuitable for speed-detection equipment.
- 2.7 Traffic calming measures were also considered at some locations, but there is unfortunately no funding available in the current or next year, so there is little more that the NAG could do.
- 2.8 **HGVs** - in previous years the NAG was involved with getting appropriate signage installed on the routes into Buckingham, and these, coupled with some new signage in the town installed this year, has considerably reduced the problem. Regrettably, there are still the occasional HGV drivers who ignore them, but the NAG had probably gone as far as it could with this particular problem.
- 2.9 **Litter & fly-tipping** – this has continued to be a problem, particularly in the vicinity of the University. Close working with the University has revealed that students are rarely to blame, thanks to University staff ensuring that new students are fully inducted and their robust action against offenders. Meanwhile, AVDC are in contact with various landlords and letting agents to ensure that new tenants know when to put out their rubbish, and are very proactive in getting reported rubbish removed.
- 2.10 Thanks to AVDC Councillor Tim Mills, we were also instrumental in getting much of the chewing gum removed from the town centre streets.

Other matters the NAG had been involved with

- 3.1 **Page Hill** - early in the year, an old problem re-emerged, concerning football-playing youths causing a noise nuisance in Page Hill. Several site visits were arranged and, once a problem with land ownership (and therefore responsibility) was resolved, consideration was given to various means of making the specific area unsuitable for such activities. Unfortunately, its proximity to the highway, the existence of underground services and ongoing grass-cutting requirements etc meant that mounding the area and/or additional planting was out of the question. AVDC were unwilling to permit a "No Ball Games" notice to be installed as, without an accompanying bye-law, it would be impossible to enforce; meaning that the only recourse for residents was to engage with AVDC's Community Safety Team by completing ASB diary sheets etc, which they seemed reluctant to do.
- 3.2 **Youth Activities** – As in previous years, the NAG had worked with other partner organisations to encourage summer activities for youngsters, to give them something to do which hopefully diverts them from more mischievous activities.
- 3.3 **Drug Awareness** – in recent months, it has become apparent that there is a potential drug problem in Buckingham. TVP's "Operation Awareness" is addressing this, and the NAG had been able to point out a couple of locations where local residents suspect dealing may occur.

Policing Successes and Challenges

- 4.1 Sgt Dover said that the current priorities were winter house burglaries (Operation Arctic), for which 20 events are planned, and increasing drug dealing in the town (Operation Awareness), although TVP continued to respond to cases of anti-social behaviour.
- 4.2 She was pleased to report that burglary of dwellings had been reduced by 41%, and Buckingham Town would shortly have a new PCSO.

BUCKINGHAM & MAIDS MORETON NEIGHBOURHOOD ACTION GROUP

- 4.3 Operation Awareness had been put into place because there had been a sharp increase in use of the class B drug Mephedrone (street names *MCAT*, *Meow-meow*, *bubbles* and *plant food*). Until 2012, this had been a legal high. The drug is more addictive than cocaine, can be ingested in a number of ways, and heavy use could shorten a user's life. "Pushers", who had been known to use the Skate Park, were exploiting younger people and, although there had been two warrants issued for suspected dealers, it was important to raise awareness of the problem.

PRIORITIES FOR THE COMING YEAR

- 5.1 Open discussion revealed ongoing concerns with late night noise, including in the Nelson Street, Church Street and Hunter Street areas. Cllr Whyte pointed out that there was little background noise and sound travelled at night.
- 5.2 Notwithstanding the conclusions at 2.5 to 2.7 above, local residents remained concerned about speeding, and Cllr Whyte suggested that they avail themselves with Local Area Forum funding for Community Speed Watch.
- 5.3 Although there was little more that could be done by the NAG with regard to HGVs (2.8 above), Cllr Smith suggested that offending vehicles continue to be reported to TVP (via the 101 number), who would need the date, time, location, licence plate number and, if apparent, the name of the haulier, in order to issue a warning letter.
- 5.4 Finally, in view of the comments at 3.3 and 4.3 above and Sgt Dover's contribution, it was suggested that the NAG see whether or not it could assist with drug awareness, as well as feed suspicions about dealing to TVP (again, via the 101 number).
- 5.5 The following three priorities were therefore agreed for the coming year:

Noise, particularly from pubs late at night, and the associated ASB

Drug Awareness

Community Speed Watch for which Mr Child, Mrs Moxon, Mr Robinson, Mrs Rodwell and Cllr Smith volunteered to undertake training and conduct speed checks.

Election of NAG Chairman for the coming year

- 6.1 Having fulfilled the role since 2007, Cllr Smith invited anyone wishing to take the Chair for the coming year to signify their interest. Nobody volunteered, and several wished him to continue. He thanked them for their expression of confidence and, albeit reluctantly, agreed to continue for yet another year.

Close

- 7.1 Cllr Smith said that there were still some vacancies for local organisations and area representatives on the NAG, and invited anyone interested in becoming a member to contact him at the end of the meeting.
- 7.2 He then thanked everyone for attending, particularly the TVP and AVDC officers who had attended to contribute to the meeting; Mrs Moxon for so ably assisting with publicity for the meeting; and Cllr Bloomfield for providing the refreshments and taking notes. He then closed the meeting.

BUCKINGHAM TWINNING ASSOCIATION

Minutes of the AGM on 18 November 2014 held in the Sunley Theatre, UofB

Present: Stephanie Scrase (Chairman), Valerie Shaw, Janet May, Sue Watkins, Cllr Chris Strain-Clark, Peter Strain-Clark, Henry Scrase, Susie Kelly, Simon Kelly, Mike Kirby, Gerry Loftus

1. Stephanie welcomed everyone and reminded them of the objectives of the Twinning Association. Apologies had been received from Jane Mordue, Howard Mordue, Cllr Terry Bloomfield, Geoffrey Shaw, Cllr Paul Hirons, Cllr Ruth Newell, Robert Munday, Margaret Caffrey.
2. Minutes of the last AGM held on 26 November 2013 were signed as accurate. This was proposed by Henry Scrase and seconded by Valerie Shaw
3. Matters arising: Stephanie reported that the twinning association in Mouvaux was becoming a separate body from the council.
4. **Chairman's report:** Stephanie advised the members present that the Twinning Association was delighted to continue to grow the links between ourselves and Mouvaux with whom we are formally twinned and Neukirchen Vluyn with whom we have a friendship agreement. Stephanie went through the Chairman's report which showed the Twinning Association had had a very full year. Particular highlights during the year included the annual visit to the Mouvaux Christmas market in December, an At Home evening with Henry and Stephanie in January, coffee and croissants at the Community Centre in February, a trip to Neukirchen Vluyn for Vluyner Mai on the May Bank Holiday weekend, the Boules Tournament in July, the Wine and Cheese evening in August for which thanks were expressed to Ron Gkeeson, the Civic visit to Mouvaux in September with thanks to Mouvaux for all their organisation and the Great Horwood Silver Band concert in October with thanks to Terry Bloomfield. Other events included paintings by Buckingham artists being included in the Mouvaux Salon des Artistes in May and some French painters works being displayed at the BAFA exhibition in November, one of which at the latter event was sold, and several film nights held at Stephanie's home. The members were also thanked for their support and participation and the Town Council for their help. Thanks were also due to Jane as Stephanie couldn't do the chairman's job without her. Reports of Twinning activities appeared in our newsletter for which thanks are due to Ron Gleeson and Margaret White, who had been keeping the local papers informed of our forthcoming events, and thank you to Geoff Shaw who keeps the website up to date. Mention was also made of a future exchange between Buckingham School, the Royal Latin School and College Maxence van der Meer in Mouvaux, initially being started as penfriends. Around 50 students from the college will be visiting Buckingham in May 2015 as part of a trip to Oxford. Stephanie thanked Terry Bloomfield our membership secretary and reminded members that the 2015 subscriptions were due soon. All members were very welcome to join our meetings held every other month at the Community Centre – the next one being at 7.30pm on Wednesday 7th January. Stephanie ended by advising the members that Twinning is helping our future generations to help and understand one another in this ever growing world.
5. **Treasurer's report:** Mike Kirby went through the accounts which had been prepared by Howard and audited by Mike. There were a couple of queries raised by Peter Strain Clarke, which in Howard's absence couldn't be clarified. Mike will contact Howard on his return and seek clarification of the omission of the deposit account interest and a discrepancy of £82.51 in the accounts and advise Peter of the outcome.
6. **Adoption of accounts:** the meeting approved the accounts subject to the explanation of the discrepancies mentioned above. Cllr Chris Strain Clarke proposed adoption of the accounts and this was seconded by Henry Scrase.
7. **Election of committee members:** The committee comprising of Stephanie Scrase (chairman), Howard Mordue (Treasurer), Jane Mordue (Secretary), John Murray, Sue Watkins, Janet May, Derek Carpenter, was happy to serve for another year. Town Council representatives are: Cllr Ruth Newell, Cllr Paul Hirons, Cllr Terry Bloomfield and Cllr Chris Strain-Clark.
8. **Review of the constitution:** the committee recommended this stayed the same.
9. **Membership subscriptions:** these were to remain the same - £5 for individuals and £8 for families or group membership. Membership forms were available at the AGM.
10. **Any other business:** Gerry Loftus asked what the differences would be once Mouvaux Twinning Association was a separate entity rather than part of the council as it now is. Stephanie said it would be a more approachable body, although it would still have funding from the council.