

## **EPNP Edlesborough Task Group Meeting 31/3/16**

### Attendees

Alan Williams  
Ben Everest  
Chris Banks  
Doug Oughton  
Jim McCook

John Wilkinson  
Kate Mulcahy  
Peter Franklin  
Richard Holmes  
Bob Feaviour

### Apologies

Cliff Hughes  
George Crutcher

Each of the previously identified key policy issues was discussed in turn

### **A. Settlement Boundary**

The principle of defining a settlement boundary as opposed to simply relying on policies akin to RA14 of AVDLP as a means of containing the village footprint was discussed at some length. It was agreed that a settlement boundary was the preferred strategy.

It was recognised that sufficient housing sites would need to be included within the settlement boundary to deliver the number of new dwellings necessary satisfy the VALP requirement for Edlesborough Village. It was also recognised that our site selection process would need to be sufficiently robust to avoid the sort of legal challenge experienced by Haddenham NP.

The number of new approvals since April 2013 was reviewed, together with the recent Cow Lane and High Street applications pending approval once the necessary S106 agreements have been completed, and found to total 90 in number. An estimate of the likely windfall delivery of new dwellings over the 20 year period of the plan was made, based on the windfall delivery over the previous 10 years from 2003 to 2013. This was established as 20, but was reduced to 18 to make allowance for non completions. 3 of these windfall applications have already been approved since April 2013, meaning that we can reliably expect at least a further 15 by 2033. Thus the anticipated new housing delivery between 2013 and 2033 without identifying any new sites currently stands at 105, compared with the Draft Issues & Options requirement of 100 to 120. The issue on windfalls needs to be confirmed with AVDC.

Thus if we adopt the current built boundary of the village, but include the two remaining HELAA sites, Good Intent (15 houses) and Dove House Close (10 houses), total delivery would be of the order of 130, which comfortably exceeds even the higher of the Issues & Options numbers.

We will need to await the final VALP figures and the outcome of the site selection study before we can finalise a settlement boundary proposal. It was noted that windfalls may occur, legitimately, outside the settlement boundary

The actual numbers required by the Local Plan (VALP) should become more apparent when AVDC's draft plan is published this spring followed by their proposed submission in late summer.

## **B. Safeguard future sites for development**

It was agreed that we should identify some land for possible future expansion of the Surgery and the School. The possibility of also safeguarding some land to provide additional parking in the vicinity of the shops was also discussed, but no such land could be identified. As such we believe the vision should be altered to remove the reference to additional land for parking.

## **C. Define Edlesborough Village Centre to protect shops.**

It was agreed that the shops provide an extremely valuable village amenity and a policy needs to be introduced to protect against any change of use of the existing retail premises.

It was also suggested that we ought to have some sort of policy relating to the use/retention/expansion of the business park at Sparrow Hall Farm, although it was unclear what that policy should be.

## **D. Define a network of green infrastructure assets.**

It was agreed that the plan needs to identify and protect a number of green space assets to ensure their continued availability to the public. These included The Green, the allotments, the open space in the middle of the new High Street development, the Cemetery and the Churchyard. The amenity land next to the Surgery was also considered, but it was recognised that if part of it could be used to better serve the needs of the community, it might not be appropriate to preclude any such use.

The field adjacent to Slicketts Lane was discussed for consideration in this category but was rejected as it was not a publicly used space apart from the footpaths that cross it.

## **E. Propose new housing types and tenures.**

It was recognised that developers prefer large detached houses for the open market and that results in a lack of starter homes for young people and smaller homes suitable for the elderly to down size to. The extent of that shortfall needs to be established as part of the anticipated questionnaire and then policies introduced to require an appropriate housing mix on new developments.

The issue of key workers was discussed but it was felt that this may be covered by the mixed tenures required on the new High Street site (to be confirmed).

## **F. Manage detail design for Edlesborough**

Policies need to be introduced to protect the amenity of existing and new residents and to preserve the current ambience of the village. Suggestions included:

- no 3 storey houses on edge of settlement developments
- no access to new developments via existing narrow cul-de-sacs
- pedestrian links through new developments

- a limit on the density of new developments
- new developments to provide a mix of designs reflecting the existing character of the village

### **G. Establish car parking standards for new developments**

It was recognised that previous and current AVDC parking guidelines are not sufficient to avoid undesirable on street parking. A policy that demands parallel off-street parking provisions (as opposed to tandem parking) was suggested for new dwellings. Additionally, where terraced housing may feature in the new housing requirement, then courtyard parking could be appropriate.

### **H. Identify and protect key views and landmark buildings**

It was agreed that the Church is the most important view in the village and must be protected and even enhanced if possible. It was suggested that the most important view looking out from the village was probably that from the Cemetery and Churchyard looking out over the Vale.

Landmark buildings that require protection include all the listed buildings and ancient monuments within the village. That protection should include not only the buildings themselves but also their settings. A specific action is to obtain a comprehensive list of these buildings via an approach to AVDC. (A meeting with AVDC is being scheduled for the week following this meeting).

### **J. Define existing community facilities to protect and support them**

A list of important community facilities needs to be established and policies developed to protect and support them. These facilities would need to include such things as the facilities on the Green, the allotments, the Cemetery, shops etc.

### **Next Steps**

- We need to identify and assess potential development sites that could deliver the new houses that are required to fulfil our growth obligations
- We need to identify a list of green infrastructure assets that need to be protected
- We need to identify and list the key views and landmark buildings that need to be protected
- We need to identify all listed buildings.
- We need to identify and list the important community facilities that require protection
- We need to set up a meeting with the owners of businesses and commercial developments such as Sparrowhall to understand their needs and expectations.

### **Attachments**

1. A list of possible policies.

The purpose of a neighbourhood plan is to generate policies that will govern future planning applications so that the vision of the plan can be achieved. To that end a series of possible policies compiled some time ago by one member of the team was shared with the group to demonstrate the form that they might take. Clearly these embryonic policies will need to be modified to reflect the views of Steering Group as a whole and ultimately the entire local community. They will also need to be updated to reflect recent planning applications and the latest developments in the emerging VALP, but it was agreed that they could form a starting point for the eventual policies to be included in the NP.

2. An aerial view of the village identifying a possible settlement boundary for Edlesborough Village.

This shows how a boundary could be established that would identify the current extent of built development (shown in red) and include sufficient provision to accommodate the additional sites necessary to generate the required growth, to allow for possible future expansion of the Surgery and the School and to reflect recently approved planning applications not yet built (all shown in yellow). This would involve the adoption of the HELAA sites referred to in item A above and the Surgery / School expansion provisions referred to in item B above.

## Attachment I

**Policy ED1** A settlement boundary to be established for each of the three villages, beyond which no development will be permitted, unless it is necessary for the purposes of agriculture, forestry or the provision of a Rural Exception Scheme to provide housing association dwellings solely for the benefit of local people. The settlement boundaries must include sufficient brownfield and/or greenfield land within them to accommodate the new housing provision required by VALP.

Reason: To enable the necessary growth required by the Local Plan to be accommodated without resulting in unnecessary urban sprawl into the surrounding countryside. A settlement boundary provides definition regarding the extent of the built up area of the village and avoids doubt.

**Policy ED2** Housing developments within the settlement boundary should be limited to no more than 10 houses on a site not exceeding 0.4 hectare. Individual buildings should be no more than two storeys in height unless special circumstances can be demonstrated to prove that there will be no adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. The density of new housing developments must not exceed 25 dwellings per hectare.

Reason: To avoid large new developments that may be more difficult to readily assimilate into the existing village community and to avoid over development of sites. Several smaller developments rather than just a few larger ones will also encourage phasing over the life of the Plan.

**Policy ED3** Any development of more than 3 houses must provide a mix of houses including small starter homes (3 beds or less) and single storey bungalows suitable for the elderly.

Reason: To redress the existing imbalance of the types of dwellings available within the Parish. This will ensure that suitable homes for first time buyers are available and facilitate existing elderly residents downsizing to properties more suited to their needs.

**Policy ED4** New homes must respect the immediate character and pattern of development and care must be taken to ensure that the amenities of adjacent properties are not unduly affected.

Reason: To protect the amenities of existing residents

**Policy ED5** New homes with 1, 2 or 3 bedrooms must be provided with at least two off street parking spaces. Those with 4 or more bedrooms must have at least 3 off street parking spaces. At least two of the parking spaces must be parallel spaces as opposed to tandem spaces.

Reason: To avoid the need for on street parking

**Policy ED6** Access roads serving new developments must be at least 5.5m wide with a footpath that is a minimum of 2m wide. Access from the main thoroughfares of the village to new developments of more than two houses must not utilise existing service roads that are less than 5.5m in width.

Reason To avoid restricted width estate roads and cul-de-sacs becoming through roads to new developments

**Policy ED7** Care must be taken to ensure that new development does not obscure from public view or compromise the setting of historic listed buildings and cottages.

Reason: To preserve as far as possible the appearance and character of the villages

**Policy ED8** New development must preserve sites of historic or archaeological interest and if possible, make them more visible to public view.

Reason: To preserve and enhance sites of historic or archaeological interest

**Policy ED9** The loss of shops, pubs, food outlets and commercial services in the community through change of use will be strongly resisted unless it can be demonstrated that reasonable efforts have been made to continue their use for these purposes.

Reason: To protect the availability of local shops and services.

**Policy ED10** New retail (A1) developments that might compromise the viability of existing retail businesses within the immediate neighbourhood will be resisted.

Reason: To protect the viability of local shops and services

**Policy ED11** New commercial (B1) developments within the defined settlement boundaries will be resisted. Commercial developments beyond the settlement boundaries may be permitted providing they are of appropriate scale and there are no undue adverse impacts on the rural landscape or road network.

Reason: To reflect the wishes of local residents.

**Attachment 2**



**Possible 2033 Edlesborough Settlement Boundary**