

**Woughton Community Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Minutes
Tuesday 26th January 2016; 10:00am – 1:00pm at Netherfield Meeting Place**

Present: Cllr Donna Fuller (DF), Cllr Alan Williamson (AW), Cllr Pauline Prop (PP), Cllr Sue Smith (SS), Cllr Yvonne Tomlinson (YT), Victoria Binko (VB) (Woughton Community Council), Claire Hutley (CH) (Woughton Community Council), Ruth McMillian (RM) (Peartree Bridge), Fred Bass (FB) (Eaglestone Residents Association), Ron Ellis (RE) (Tinkers Bridge), Trevor Green (TG) (Tinkers Bridge), Andy Tomlinson-Smith (ATS) (Coffee Hall), Corina Tomlinson-Smith (CTS) (Coffee Hall), Heather Pollard (HP) (Christ the Vine), Diane Webber (DW) (Milton Keynes Council), Neil Homer (NH) (rCOH)

Apologies: Cllr Kevin Wilson, Cllr Pete Orme, Cllr Brian Fitzwilliam, Janette Bobey (NFLD), Cliff Green, Cath Pantling, Lizzie Bailes (MKC), Lesley Sutton (MKUH)

Absent: Cllr Joyce Hall, Cllr John Orr, Cllr Brian Walker

Roundtable introductions

NP 28/16 – Announcement from Chair of Woughton Community Council

- Chair of WCC sends his apologies, chair of SG makes announcement
- SS: Reminded that only one residential representative from each estate will be able to attend meetings, in accordance with the Terms of Reference and Delegated Powers
- By estates residential representatives are:
 - o Beanhill: Cath Pantling, Beanhill Action Group
 - o Coffee Hall: Andy Tomlinson-Smith, on behalf of Coffee Hall Residents Association
 - o Eaglestone: Fred Bass, Eaglestone Residents Association
 - o Leadenhall: TBD
 - o Netherfield: Janette Bobey, Netherfield Residents Association
 - o Peartree Bridge: Ruth McMillian
 - o Tinkers Bridge: Cliff Green, Tinkers Bridge Residents Association
- While it is acknowledged that each estate can have more than one representative on the running (for example Cliff Green, Ron Ellis, Kathy Higgins and Trevor Green have attended a Steering Group meeting on behalf of Tinkers Bridge), it is necessary that either a formal substitute is created or that representatives take it in turn to attend the meetings to ensure that only one representative attends a SG meeting at a time. This is to ensure that numbers are kept under control and that meetings are as productive as possible.
- VB: Due to the passing of Cllr Len Bangell, who was on the SG, Cllr Brian Fitzwilliam will attend as the Parish Councilor representative for Netherfield

NOTED

NP 29/16 – Residential representatives

- Introduction of Fred Bass as Eaglestone Residents Association representative
- Identified that Andy Tomlinson-Smith will be the residential representative for Coffee Hall on behalf of Coffee Hall Residents Association
- The only estate left without a Resident for is Leadenhall, YT is working hard to acquire a representative that will be able to attend the Steering Group meetings

NOTED

NP 30/16 – Approve minutes of last Steering Group meeting

- Held on 8 December 2015

ACCEPTED AND APPROVED

RM & DW joined the meeting at roughly 10:30am

NP 31/16 – Update on Neighbourhood Plan project plan and status (led by Victoria Binko, WCC)

- Went through December 2015 Summary Report
- Went through Summary of First Round of Consultation
 - o VB: will post on WCC website for resident access
- Went through Housing Advice & Assessment Report
 - o VB: was a desktop study undertaken as the Technical Support Package of our grant award from Locality. Looks into the demand side only (i.e. what our current housing needs are) and it is now our job as the SG to examine how or if this need can be met within the Woughton area. The report does make a suggestion of how many houses should be built within the plan period, but it is up to the SG to determine other factors that can influence this number (i.e. protection of green spaces, housing size / type / tenure etc.)
 - o NH: noted that this is a very academic report and should be taken with some caution as it is not normally done at a parish level.
 - o PP: noted that especially in Tinkers Bridge there is an issue with overcrowding and the need for more rooms in homes
 - o YT: housing problem influenced by the Right to Buy scheme and social houses not being replaced
 - NP could encourage a better mix of housing (most specifically starter and affordable homes, maybe even low level flats)
 - o RE: agreed with PP and Tinkers Bridge needs more 2 bedroom homes, but thinks that flats will not be suited for Tinkers Bridge
 - o DF: emphasized the needs for mechanisms of protection so that homes are not immediately bought up by private developers for high rents
 - Maybe flats are not the best option, could look into marionettes
 - Most needed elements of the NP: starter and affordable homes, tenure control if possible
 - o NH: NP will be influenced by national policy directions. Government working to broaden the definition of affordable homes to include starter

homes. Self-build and custom builds are more popular in other countries but can be brought into to NP (will be a cheaper option than buying a ready built house out right). NP could influence the proportion of these builds & the overall housing mix. Other changes in the national planning system include reintroduction of the Right to Buy scheme with 5 Housing Associations.

- RE: worried that Regeneration will not meet the needs of the local people first; emphasized that the definition of 'affordable housing' nationally is not actually affordable for local people here
- FB: emphasized that pg42 of the report indicated that the social housing need for Woughton residents may not be best suited inside Woughton itself, given the current social housing levels, and should be met somewhere else in MK.
- NH: NP will have considerable impact on the things it can influence in the planning process. Stated that this work is needed in order to make a successful & influential NP – needs to be able to match community desires with reality in terms of planning.

CTS and ATS joined the meeting at 11am

- NH: Documents that need pointing out are the MKC report recommending Mears Ltd as the partner in December 2015 as well as the Site Allocation Options.
 - Need a NP that covers all bases so we are prepared if MKC chooses refurbishment or redevelopment. Needs to be both prescriptive and flexible to manage expectations.
 - Highlighted that the NP can either identify a different housing mix needed per estate or it could be the same over the whole of the parish – up to the SG to decide.
 - Most important thing about next round of consultation is getting the opinions of residents as to what they want and more importantly why they went with that option.
 - YT: Is it possible to manage the numbers of HMOs in the NP?
 - NH: yes because HMOs need planning permission. Can influence the ones that are within the MKC criteria.
 - DW: MKC has an existing HMO policy, and the NP can change the proportions if need be.
 - DF: What can we do to those HMOs that are just under the criteria, can we change the criteria themselves?
 - DW: No cannot change the criteria themselves because that is set nationally.
 - NH: Can however refine the general policy about HMOs.
- Funding
- VB: have used first grant awarded from Locality worth £8000, mainly used on consultation and running costs. Will be applying for second and final round of grant funding worth £6000 in February 2016 so the funds are available to use by April 2016. This was chosen because a condition of the grant is that funds have to be used within 6 months or at the end of the financial year, whichever is sooner. Therefore we will wait for the

funding in order to use the £6000 over six months to better spread our resources. However this means that the consultation on the Issues & Futures Document that is scheduled to start at the end of February 2016 will have to be done with little to no financial resources – which is more than doable. The SG has to think about which consultation options have the best balance of financial viability with community impact.

NOTED

NP 32/16 – Discussion about next stage of development

- VB: Distributed and discussed Issues & Futures Document (presents background info, context, and options Woughton has with their respective pros and cons as well as input from community engagement)
 - pg3: “reach the end of their intended life”, originally included because mirrors Regeneration language, and historical perceptions (i.e. some estates were built to last 10 years, but there is no hard proof of this)
 - YT, AW, RE: too harsh, mainly an issue of maintenance – even though made of non-standard building material the houses are still standing
 - CH: should remove sentence – agreed
 - Should identify that health is often linked to housing (pg3 or elsewhere or in actual draft plan)
 - YT: bungalows are specially made for disabled persons so of course that type of housing would attract those that are disabled or in poorer health
 - DW: pointed out that disabled access remains for the house which has it (i.e. once has disabled access will often always have that designation and will always be used for disabled people)
 - Should identify this fact so that it challenges the historical perceptions of the area
 - VB: will try to find data to back up claims (so it can be used as evidence) – **action**
 - Milton Keynes Core Strategy (2013) & Local Plan (2005) section pg3
 - CH: change ‘planning policies for Woughton’ to ‘... for Milton Keynes’ because this section is talking about MK level planning documents – agreed
 - CH: change to ‘major changes in the coming years to Woughton’ – agreed
 - NH: will try to outline parish boundary on Plan B map and make a full page size – **action**
 - Milton Keynes Core Strategy (2013) & Local Plan (2005) section pg4
 - DW: change to ‘more recent development schemes like the Academy have taken place’ – agreed
 - DW: second paragraph also needs to identify that the Local Plan 2005 identifies general policies for the whole of MK which would impact Woughton – agreed
 - CH: should specifically identify the land of significant heritage as the Old Rectory in Peartree Bridge, only area in the parish.
 - NH: also that Peartree Lane is significant for animal crossings

- Plan:MK section section pg5
 - DW: change from Strategic Development Options Consultation to Strategic Development Directions Consultation. Consultation on that document from January 2016 to April 2016. Change to 'four possible different ways that the city can continue to grow'; add something to say 'or a combination of the four possible different ways' – agreed
- Regeneration:MK Programme section pg6
 - NH: will make Plan D diagram single page; will get high resolution image from DW. Rename title of diagram to Plan D: Plan MK: Strategic Development Direction 4 Key Diagram – agreed
 - CH: 'Bean Hill' changed to 'Beanhill' throughout – agreed
- Regeneration:MK Programme section pg7
 - NH: paragraph 2 – noted that this mix of housing area, green and open space, and road area is specific to New Towns. The average housing density in the Regeneration identified estates is actually the UK average starting point, but is low for MK as a whole
 - VB: paragraph 4 – some 10,000 people [in Regeneration identified estates] should be changed to some 9000 people – agreed
- Community consultation section pg8
 - VB: should add a statement relating to public transport issues in the list of bulleted points – agreed.
 - Pg9 VB will send draft version of Tinkers Bridge Community Action Plan to all SG members – **action**
- Planning issues for Woughton section pg9
 - VB: should add statements relating to a) industrial areas of Bleak Hall and Redmoor; b) sports, leisure and recreation needs and how they can be enhanced; and c) arts and culture (either enhancing local opportunities or enhancing connections to existing areas) – agreed
 - DF: would like to quantify the need for more surgeries and GP practices due to the long wait to get an appointment
 - DW: can contact MK CCG to get more information – **action**
 - RE & SS: would like to investigate the possibility to have one GP practice on each estate in the NP
 - YT: noted that London schools are smaller in ha then here because they are built up instead of out
- Planning issues for Woughton section pg10
 - VB: add question prompts throughout, for example *What are your thoughts? Do have anything else to add? We want to know your comments* – agreed
- Refurbishment option pg12
 - SS: add something in either the explanation or the potential negative section about how there will be no money for refurbishment without some level of regeneration, for example may not be enough development to finance refurbishment – agreed

- DF: add something about potential problems to maintain social network with lack of housing mix in potential negatives section – agreed
- HP: can delete the last bullet point in the potential negatives about no improvements to bus services because constricts earlier statement above about better bus services to Hospital; will allow for more balanced approach – agreed
- Redevelopment option pg13
 - VB: paragraph 3 – may be a slight – agreed. Pg13 paragraph 1 change to ‘as the illustration below shows’ – agreed
 - NH: paragraph 2 – noted that 400 new primary school places will be needed to match that potential increase in population. Pg14 paragraph 2 – add a statement about how policies can be estate specific or general for all estates – agreed
 - SS: pg15 – add something about generating funds needed for refurbishment to potential positives section – agreed
- Discussion about consultation strategy once Issues & Futures Document is released (led by Victoria Binko, WCC)
 - DF: best to talk to people through natural community traffic. For example standing outside schools like New Chapter and shops, set up a street stall in the morning and afternoon
 - VB: good idea, because it would be an extension of the successful nature of the Drop in Sessions
 - VB: other consultation ideas include
 - walkshops (walking around estates, hitting the ground and pointing out things they would like the NP to address)
 - workshops
 - photo / design competitions in schools (design your ideal house / neighbourhood)
 - going to community groups and getting their opinions directly (specifically religious groups, black and ethnic minorities, industrial areas etc.)
 - will discuss more specifically and agree on actions at the next meeting

NOTED

NP 33/16 – Agree on date for next meeting

- Tuesday, 9 February 2016, 10:30am-12pm @ WCC offices in Netherfield (33-37 Farthing Grove, Netherfield, MK6 4JH)
 - To discuss consultation strategy for I&F Document
- Tuesday, 5 April 2016, 10:30am-12:30pm @ WCC offices in Netherfield

Next Steering Group Meeting: Tuesday, 9 February 2016, 10:30am-12pm @ WCC offices