

North Crawley Parish Neighbourhood Plan Minutes of Meeting

Meeting Held:	The Cock Inn, 23 rd January 2020
Present:	Helen Beauchamp - HB (minutes); Derek Harpur - DH; Nic Sadeghi - NS; James Sandall – JS (Chairman); Keith Shaw - KS; Chris Stavrinides – CS; Richard Sykes – RS; Ian Thody – IT; Chris Toye - CT
Apologies:	None
Public Observers:	N/A
Distribution:	All members of the steering group; Parish Council; Parish Council website; Facebook; email distribution list
Meeting No:	10
1. Minutes and matters arising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is with regret that we accept the resignation of Andy Gresty from the steering group. Unfortunately, Andy is unable to continue owing to personal reasons. The group has received notification that another resident has asked to join the group, HB will make contact to formally invite her. • DH will take over as SCAN correspondent, NS, CT and IT will join JS on the subcommittee, providing a pool to draw on for meetings with landowners – 2 is the optimum number for such meetings. • Amendment to draft minutes: in item 3, change H7 to H5; currently awaiting a response from MK planning team re affordable housing so expunge reference to NPPF, as context not yet clear; clarify settlement boundary comment from MKC • NS has been in contact with J Banham in MK planning department, she has passed his queries to D Blandamer and NS is awaiting a response (see continuing discussions below)
2. Letter from PC objecting to Orchard Way development	A paragraph was added to the objection letter after the PC meeting, which noted the potential for including the Orchard Way site in the neighbourhood plan housing allocation. This paragraph had not been discussed with the steering group and seemed to suggest that the PC was working separately to the steering group. Until the steering group had identified suitable sites there should be no assumptions made and the PC needs to ensure that all decisions are made with the full involvement of the steering group. JS to speak to PC chair
3. Prep for public meeting	Discussed value of asking for further clarification re reasons for voting no in the referendum. Decided we already have a good idea as to why the plan was rejected. More value in focusing efforts on formulating models that can be presented for feedback at a future public meeting. Important to inform people of what the group has been doing for the last few weeks and clarify what is meant by affordable housing, as well as explaining the importance of the settlement boundary. Answer pre-submitted questions and take questions from the floor. HB will provide box for written questions/comments
4. Continuing discussions	Settlement boundary – it is important not to create a disconnect with the current village settlement. Sites within or adjacent to the settlement boundary will score more favourably against the assessment criteria than sites that are not contiguous. New residents should be encouraged to integrate with the community and thus be close to facilities.



**THE FUTURE
OF NORTH
CRAWLEY
PARISH**
Have your say...

	<p>Discussed sites that did not score well against the criteria and thus are ruled out of consideration for inclusion in the plan as development sites. The subcommittee will write to the landowners explaining the process and the reasons behind the decision. Some sites either within the boundary or adjacent to will be considered and landowners need to be involved in discussions. Other sites need to be assessed and therefore have the potential to be included. There may be new sites, not yet considered.</p> <p>Some sites were rejected previously because they were large sites and apparently not within walking distance of the village. These were not popular with some villagers who were concerned about a large field being filled with a large housing estate. There is the potential to reconsider such a large site for a smaller number of houses and in a position that has limited impact on the surrounding dwellings.</p> <p>It is important to clarify the type of affordable housing that is required in the village. Respondents to the questionnaire made it clear that more rented property was not desirable and that low cost, starter homes were desirable to assist young people onto the property ladder. We may not need to refer to this in the plan as 'affordable housing' thus removing the need to provide a site of 11 or more houses. In that case, there is no obligation on the part of the developer to provide affordable housing according to the definition but it is then important to ensure that the plan stipulates the type of housing that will be acceptable on a particular site. Discussion with landowners may elicit support for a plot of starter homes.</p>
5. AOB	CS would like to propose a plot of land for consideration, he will email details to all members prior to the meeting on the 6 th Feb. To be discussed at the meeting
6. Actions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NS to send email sent to MK planning team to HB – for the record – by Sun 26th Jan 2. HB to email points for information and discussion for public meeting – by Sun 26th Jan 3. All to read bullet points and comment on if required – by Wed 29th 4. JS to contact PC re objection letter – by Fri 25th Jan 5. HB to send landowner letter to NS; NS to draft a new letter as required by 6th Feb 6. All to prepare for meeting on 6th Feb by considering potential sites within or adjacent to the settlement boundary and bring along details of any new sites proposed. If sites have previously been refused permission for development, the group needs to consider the reasons why refusal was made and consider whether these continue to be relevant 7. CS to email group members with details of potential site by Thurs 30th Jan 8. HB to contact potential new steering group member – by Sun 26th Jan
7. Date of Next Meeting	<p style="text-align: center;">Public Meeting Thursday 30th January, 7.30pm in the Village Hall</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Steering Group only – Thursday 6th February, 7.30pm, The Cock Inn</p>