

BUDBROOKE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING TEAM –

Notes from Sub Group meeting held on Tuesday 7th July from 7.30 – 9.00 p.m.

at the Open Door

Present – Andy Thomas, Mike Dutton, Dene Jackson-Clark, Rhonda Hayles, Roger Hampson, Frank Roper, Dave Shirley, Maggie Treacy, Angie Morrell, & Linda Price.

Apologies - Ian Low, Paul Simmons

- 1) Claire from Kirkwells was welcomed to this meeting and invited to explain the Budbrooke Planning Policy Assessment and Environmental Review document (all 95 pages) to the group. This document details the National and Local current and emerging policies some of which will need to be included in the final Neighbourhood plan. It was noted there appeared to be some duplication and Claire clarified that some policies were older and in the process of being renewed so we need to take into account both versions.
- 2) Frank pointed out that one WDC policy recognised gypsy and travellers, affordable housing and housing for older people as part of the mix of housing but did not include self build homes within the policy as it was required to do so by the NPPF. A group of 10 self-builders would need to form a consortium and purchase a plot. Petersfield NP has covered this in some detail so it might be worth looking at their plan. It was further noted that the WDC local plan was recently rejected by National Govt and a written response sent to challenge this. WDC should have a reply in 28 days which may allow the current plan to be amended or they may need to start again which could cause up to 2 yrs. delay. This issue makes the Budbrooke plan more imperative. Our plan would have to be taken into account once it's past the 'submitted' stage.
- 3) Claire answered the questions posed from last week's meeting.
- 4) Should we tally count postcodes on survey responses ? **This has now been completed as due diligence and a cross check as to locations and residency.**
- 5) Can we dictate plot sizes and housing density and styles? **Not plot size but yes to density and style. In rural areas policy allows for 25 homes per hectare so 100 homes would take up 4 hectares of the 6.5 hct.site the rest will be used for roads, parks/open spaces and for any community buildings. The plan can indicate homes should be in keeping with current styles and the bye-law detailing open front gardens can be taken into account. The plan could indicate that developers install infrastructure ready for a self-build site.**
- 6) Can current land owners place a covenant on development to prevent unwanted inappropriate building? **This is land law and its advisable not to invite reps from King Henry VIII to sub-group meetings as they could be seen to be influencing the plan. The NP could put restrictions of new builds in perpetuity within the plan.**
- 7) How can we envisage/ plan for housing plot sizes along with open/park spaces and community sites and utility land? **Density is controlled - thereby controlling plot sizes and open spaces will be included. The new build need to have "suitable amenity space and play spaces" allocated.**
- 8) Could/should we include in our plan the opportunity to further develop buildings such as the Community Centre, GP surgery and school and use this brownfield land for further development? **As discussed last week the sub-group could include a plan A, B and C offering different options in terms of community buildings moving from the status quo (with perhaps a bit of development i.e. second storey to the surgery and more storage at the CC) moving to a fully integrated Hub which could include all services. The costs may become the problem as the CIL is only likely to be around £125k and, as an example, Chase Meadow community centre cost £1.3 million and the community had to fundraise around half of that (£619,000 was from S106 funding).**
- 9) Do we plan for the demographic trend we face now or can we project into the future to better plan for 5 or 10 years' time? **The plan will run for this planning period up to 2029 and demographics will move towards more older people living longer. The Census (altho there were concerns this is now very out of date!) will give more information and this needs to be taken into account. The survey shows that smaller homes /retirement bungalows are required and these should be 'pepperpot' distribution throughout the development rather than have dedicated roads for older peoples' bungalows that then become isolated and lifeless.**

- 10) If this building plot has been taken out of green belt how can we protect from this happening again in future even if green belt boundary is re-defined? **We cannot although it's not likely to happen until after 2029. But it should be noted that HM is a growth village.**
- 11) Could we issue pro-forma invoices for work to be done to ensure we do not have to return any un-used Localities funding by early December? **Yes so long as the work is completed within the current financial year.**
- 12) The mandatory environmental report in the breakdown of services by Kirkwells shows 'Warwick' in the costs column. Does this mean the report already exists and is obtainable from WDC. Information received suggested this cost could be in the region of £8k - £10k. Can you clarify this position please? **A mandatory Strategic Environment Assessment Survey will be done by WDC foc. As there are no landscape or heritage issues this should be straight forward.**
- 13) A new more detailed time schedule of activity from now till the end of the funding period in early December was requested of Claire so the sub-group was clear in what tasks it has to undertake in terms of further consultation and discussion. Claire will send this to us by next week (i.e. by 14th July).
- 14) The group then looked at the survey responses to formulate these into objectives. They recognised that many community facilities were well used and need to be protected and enhanced through this plan. Frank noted that the WDC policy on affordable housing had been amended to apply only to urban housing. Claire explained that the HM chosen site was regarded as urban.
(Q3)
- 15) The types of homes generated much discussion (Q5). The group felt that affordable homes should be offered to people with connections to Budbrooke. Its likely 40% will be affordable and this category could include retirement bungalows or smaller (2 bed) houses. These will be built and operated by a Registered Social Landlord and consideration was given to approaching these (Orbit, Jephson, Bromford etc.) however the site would be publicised as available and an RSL would purchase if they wished to. Kirkwells will draw from the census what is currently here and what will drive future needs.
- 16) It was noted that if people work from home additional 'study' space or room would be a requirement of new homes. (Q6)
- 17) Q7 – what do you not like about homes – many people expressed concerns about increased traffic both throughout build time and once homes were occupied. A map was shown to Claire to see the problem and there will be restrictions that can be placed on timings of delivery. Access points are off Arras Boulevard and perhaps off Daly Avenue – all are small /tight roads. Any developer will have to formulate a construction management plan to manage traffic and noise nuisance. There may be an opportunity to use a Hampton Road access point if land could be made available. The RA have already ascertained that builders wagons will come via Hampton on the Hill (which is a tiny village) and there are already bottleneck points into and out of Budbrooke at the lights under the bridge (into Parkway) and again at Budbrooke Road T-junction. More vehicles would exacerbate this. Andy indicated that WCC allows .6 of a car per home thus an additional 60 vehicles could be added to our roads – the group felt this was an under-representation. It was noted there may also be construction vehicles at Hatton Park and Opus 40 further complicating the pressure on local roads.
- 18) The group then looked at common words residents used to describe Budbrooke (Q9). It was felt important to build objectives around themes that rated highly such as countryside/ beautiful/ rural/ picturesque. And that safe/secure should be addressed by 'Secured by design' or Build for life 12 strategies to ensure high levels of safety on the new site. There was also a need to landmark roads and closes so that they did not all look the same thus confusing residents and visitors.
- 19) Some discussions have indicated that existing homes adjacent to the site fear being overlooked by the new development and whilst residents have no right to a view steps could be taken to lessen this impact. For example the land dips down and legislation dictates privacy and outlook standards. There is an Active Street Frontages design policy where windows face the street.
- 20) Angie asked about landscaping new gardens, open /play spaces and for privacy. Developers are not likely to landscape gardens but will put grass and shrubs in open spaces. It was agreed the plan would include statements about what sort of landscaping would be appropriate (for example no Leylandii trees).
- 21) Many residents were concerned about developing Green Belt but it was acknowledged that the NP Plan does not have the power to remove the proposed HM site from being used for housing

development. However the NP could influence the way the proposed site was developed and should emphasise that no further sites should be chosen from green belt land in HM for large scale housing development.

- 22) The three little words list was interesting and could be included and residents quotes in 'clouds' throughout the document if that was thought to be appropriate.
- 23) Claire agreed to develop a new schedule of activities by 10th July a skeleton document by 30th July. This skeleton was not for public consumption at this stage but for the sub-group to critically review and agree what should and should not be included. This feedback would then generate a second skeleton plan that would go for community consultation perhaps at the Parish Show on 13th September (maybe also have a drop in day at the Open Door as previously suggested).
- 24) DATE OF NEXT MEETING – TBA once skeleton plan has been received but possibly first week of August.