

**Stoke Mandeville Parish Council**

*Clerk: Mrs Sarah Copley*

**Minutes of the meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE held at the Community Centre, Eskdale Road, Stoke Mandeville.**

**Thursday, 1 September 2016 at 10am**

**PRESENT:** Cllrs: Jenny Hunt (Chair), Stephen Atkinson, Barbara Ezra, Marus Rogers and Stephen Pluckwell.

<b>P16/100</b>	<b>APOLOGIES</b>  Apologies were received from Cllr Clark member of the Committee. Other Councillors: Cllrs Butler, Kirve, Starr, Swinney and Wood. Absent: Cllr Garrett member of the Committee	
<b>P16/101</b>	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>  There were no declarations of interest.	
<b>P16/102</b>	<b>RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT VALE OF AYLESBURY PLAN</b>  The Committee was reminded that the closing date for submitting responses to the draft VALP was Monday 5 <sup>th</sup> September. Reference was made to the well attended Public Meeting organised by the Council on 16 <sup>th</sup> August 2016 from which Cllr Rogers had kindly agreed to draw together a draft response for consideration by the Planning Committee having been given Executive Powers by the Parish Council to deal with this.  Cllr Rogers had produced the document in two stages being a summary response [circulated] and a much larger background document dealing with the issues and Policies and referenced to the AVDC consultation. This latter document was incomplete at the time of the meeting.  Both draft responses were fully discussed. It was noted that should the VALP not be produced by AVDC by 2017 the Government would intervene and determine Planning policies. Issues within the draft response summary concerned the timing of the consultation during a peak holiday period and emphasised poor communication by the local planning authority. The duty to co operate was fully discussed when it was noted that some 12,00 homes were proposed in AV to meet the housing needs in Chiltern, South Bucks and Wycombe Districts which was being unfairly exploited by neighbouring authorities. The efforts of AVDC in resisting this were supported.  It was noted that Aylesbury Town Garden Growth sites would fall on the fringes of Aylesbury including Stoke Mandeville and that land within the Parish had been allocated to take the needs of Aylesbury Town and that these allocations should not be considered until there was greater clarity.  The Chairman referred to comments made at the public meetings when the major issues had been:  [i] the avoidance of coalescence between Stoke Mandeville village and the town;  [ii] the protection of green spaces; and  [iii] the need to challenge the failure of neighbouring authorities' reasons for invoking the duty to co operate in a way that benefitted their own District areas.  She said that correspondence and comments had since been received, one of which had suggested that as the village was mentioned as a separate entity in the VALP. A map defining the village settlement should be sent to AVDC stating that there should be no coalescence between the growth of Aylesbury and the village and that there should be a strategic green gap between the two individual settlements to prevent urban sprawl. Discussion ensued around the definition of parish and village. It was agreed that this point concerning the village settlement be included in the response with the map	

	<p>provided by the Clerk. Furthermore, that clarification be sought as to why Stoke Mandeville had been referenced as the area of only the village with Hawkslade, Stoke Leys and Stoke Grange being referenced as Aylesbury Garden Town.</p> <p>There were concerns that no mention of HS2 had been made in the draft Plan although the route had been agreed since 2010. The Summary had also included a Proposals map and current methods of responding to planning applications by AVDC whereby little account was taken of material considerations and only the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>There was agreement that the Summary Response be supported subject to the following inclusions :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Scale of Growth</b></li> </ul> <p>The scale of growth should be reviewed in that the expected growth take of AVDC from neighbouring authorities as part of the duty to co operate was unrealistic and should be reviewed with development potential in other areas being independently assessed before any further decisions were taken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Growth of Aylesbury and Stoke Mandeville</b></li> </ul> <p>The settlement map defining the settlement boundary of the village should be attached to the response particularly as the village is mentioned as a separate entity in the VALP. There should be no coalescence between what is being termed as “Aylesbury growth” and Stoke Mandeville Village and the strategic green gap between the two individual settlements should be retained in order to prevent urban sprawl.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Employment sites</b></li> </ul> <p>Commercial and light industry employment sites should be encouraged.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>HS2</b></li> </ul> <p>It was noted that not reference was made to East West Rail within the draft VALP which would have a significant effect on Stoke Mandeville.</p> <p>Cllr Rogers agreed was thanked by the Committee for his work in preparing the draft response. The Summary Response would be amended as discussed and forwarded with the completed Background paper to the Chairman for forwarding by the Clerk to AVDC within the required timescale.</p>	
<p><b>P16/103</b></p>	<p><b>ANY OTHER MATTERS FOR INFORMATION</b></p> <p>Questions were raised as to latest information available on the proposed Gladman development site Lower Road East. It was noted that the application had been agreed by AVDC Development Control Committee at the end of July subject to satisfactory financial negotiations with the applicant which had been devolved to officers. To date a formal decision was awaited.</p> <p>Discussion ensued on the proposal by the applicant for a second access from the site through the boundary hedge to the Parish Council’s Playing Field. No approach had been made to the Parish Council by the applicant or their Agent at any time. Considerable concerns were expressed by Councillors that this access could lead to a new “footpath” \ cycle path being created the playing field in order to access the station and post office. A third access could also cause problems in the case of events taking place on the field.</p> <p>During the ensuing debate it was agreed to seek clarification from the LPA as to whether this second access was necessary to the development of the site and could this have implications for the S106 Agreement.</p> <p>It was further agreed to recommend to the Parish Council that if and when any approach was made for an access to the Playing Field in order to access this should be refused to preserve the integrity of the boundaries.</p>	

<b>P16/104</b>	<b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b>  The next meeting had been scheduled for 8 <sup>th</sup> September in the Committee Room at 10.30am when developers would be attending to talk to the proposal for the building of 73 housing units on land behind Eskdale and Station Roads. There would be an opportunity to ask questions. The public engagement session with the developers would take place as from 2 pm.  It had been advised by the Case Officer that a new closing date for comments had been set as 20 <sup>th</sup> October and therefore the application could now be considered by the Council at its meeting on 13 <sup>th</sup> September	
----------------	---	--

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_