

Minutes of an Extraordinary meeting of **The Full Council** of Buckingham Town Council held on Monday 27 April 2026 at 7pm in the Council Chamber, Cornwalls Meadow, Buckingham.

**Present:**

|                     |              |
|---------------------|--------------|
| Cllr. F. Davies     | Town Mayor   |
| Cllr. J. Harvey     |              |
| Cllr. H. Haydock    |              |
| Cllr. A. Mahi       | Deputy Mayor |
| Cllr. H. Mordue     |              |
| Cllr. J. Mordue     |              |
| Cllr. Ruth Newell   |              |
| Cllr. R. Newall     |              |
| Cllr. L. O'Donoghue |              |
| Cllr. A. Schaefer   |              |
| Cllr. S. Singh      |              |
| Cllr. R. Stuchbury  |              |

**Also present:**

|                  |                                 |
|------------------|---------------------------------|
| Ms. C. Molyneux  | Town Clerk                      |
| Mr. S. Beech     | Compliance and Projects Manager |
| Mrs. A. Benoy    | Committee Administrator         |
| Mrs. N. Stockill | Senior Administrator            |
| Ms. S. McMurtrie | Town Plan Officer (via Zoom)    |

**Absent:**

Cllr. R. Ahmed  
Cllr. T. Allen  
Cllr. M. Try  
Cllr. L. Draper  
Cllr. R. Poppe

No members of the public attended and so there was no public session.

**656/25 Apologies for absence**

Members received and agreed apologies for absence from Cllr. Ahmed, Cllr. Draper, Cllr. M. Try and Cllr. Allen.

**657/25 Declarations of interest**

Cllr. Stuchbury advised that he is the Chair of the Buckingham and Gawcott Charitable Trust.

**658/25 Buckinghamshire Council consultation on CIL charging schedule**

Members received a report from the Town Plan Officer.

Cllr. Harvey summarised that the outcome would result in reduced infrastructure provision and lower margins for housing development in this area. He highlighted a lack of supporting data, noting that local councils had not been consulted, which was described as a serious omission. Cllr. Harvey asked whether Buckinghamshire Council would be bound by the examiner's recommendations or would simply take them into account. He also stated that a unitary council should operate as a single, consistent system across the

whole county and expressed strong support for the submitted comments. He criticized the policy of 400+ homes being assessed at £0.

The Town Plan Officer responded that decisions would need to be guided by viability and infrastructure considerations, and that the consultant's report represents the best available assessment of viability. She clarified that Buckinghamshire Council would not be strictly bound by the recommendations but may take them into account through the consultation process. She further noted that the values referenced relate to the former Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC) area and do not reflect property prices across the entire county, effectively drawing a boundary around the old AVDC district.

Cllr. Stuchbury commended the work of the Working Group and the Town Plan Officer and mentioned that the consultant's report was based on VALP infrastructure delivery and thus there was not indication of how infrastructure after the new Local Plan would be delivered.

Cllr. Schaefer reported that she had written to the Service Director and received a response from a directorate mailbox. She queried whether Buckinghamshire Officers had seen any of the calculations underpinning the consultant's report and noted that the response stated they had not. She expressed concern that Members were being asked to accept the findings at face value, without access to or insight into the underlying data and were effectively being asked to rely on the information and responses provided without independent verification.

Cllr. Haydock clarified that the assumptions do not suggest differing build costs in absolute terms, but rather that costs are expressed as a percentage. She explained that these assumptions are driven by average property prices in Buckingham and Aylesbury and are based on general market averages rather than new-build values. As a result, they do not reflect the actual characteristics or pricing of current new-build developments and fail to account for real development conditions.

Cllr. J. Mordue advocated the prematurity argument as being the leading argument to present.

Members reviewed the consultation questions and agreed the following amendments:

- **Question 1:** No changes.
- **Question 2:** Amend wording from "leading to delivery of less affordable homes" to "leading to delivery of fewer affordable homes."
- **Question 3:** Clarify that developer costs are assumed to be the same and, therefore, the end values should also be consistent.
- **Question 4:** No changes.
- **Question 5:** De-emphasise the distinction relating to developments of fewer than 10 houses by removing the specific reference to developments of 1–9 dwellings.
- **Question 6:** Raise concerns regarding differential development costs and the reliance on average sale prices rather than new-build values, which may differ significantly. It was also suggested to challenge the comparison with Aylesbury, noting that Buckingham and Aylesbury are materially different in terms of urban development. To also query as to how this would deliver needed infrastructure in future.
- **Question 7:** Agreed response is "No." To also query that it was not clear how an instalment plan would affect the 5 year time limit on expenditure by parish/town council of CIL receipts.
- **Question 8:** No

**BTC/11/25**

Proposed by Cllr Singh and seconded by Cllr Harvey. A vote was taken and the results were:

In favour: 12

Against: 1

**ACTION TOWN PLAN OFFICER**

- **Question 9:** A proposal by Cllr Schaefer to respond “Yes,” while expressing disappointment at the lack of detailed, quantifiable evidence, was put forward but subsequently withdrawn.

Proposed by Cllr. Davies and seconded by Cllr. Schaefer that the response should be “I don’t know,” noting that while members agree with the overarching principles, they do not necessarily support the way in which they are being applied. Concerns were also raised regarding a significant funding gap in Buckingham.

A vote was taken and the motion was unanimously **AGREED**

**ACTION TOWN PLAN OFFICER**

- **Question 10:** Members re-emphasised that this is premature pending agreement of the Local Plan.
- **Question 11:** No change

It is recommended that Buckingham Town Council submits the consultation responses noted above, with discretion given to the Town Plan Officer to make supportive adjustments if required before the closing date. Proposed by Cllr. Schaefer, seconded by Cllr. Newall and unanimously **AGREED**.

**ACTION TOWN PLAN OFFICER**

Members considered the recommendation that Buckingham Town Council request to be heard by the Independent Examiner.

An amendment was proposed by Cllr Stuchbury that a Councillor also attend the next Growth and Infrastructure Select Committee to present the Town Council’s concerns. This was seconded by Cllr Schaefer and unanimously **AGREED**.

A vote was then taken on the substantive motion, as amended and unanimously **AGREED**.

**ACTION TOWN PLAN OFFICER**

**659/25 Chair’s announcements - for information only**

Cllr. Davies noted the next committee meeting would be the final of the Council year and thanked Members for their support.

**660/25 Date of the next meetings:**

Annual Statutory Meeting: Monday 11<sup>th</sup> May 2026

Full Council: Monday 11<sup>th</sup> May 2026

Meeting closed at 19.57pm

Signed .....

Date .....