

Woughton Community Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Minutes

Tuesday 8th December 2015; 11:00am – 2:00pm at Netherfield Meeting Place

Present: Cllr Alan Williamson, Cllr Pauline Prop, Cllr Sue Smith, Cllr Yvonne Tomlinson, Cllr Kevin Wilson, Janette Bobey (NF), Ruth McMillian (PTB), Lesley Sutton (MKUH), Neil Homer (rCOH), Victoria Binko (WCC), Claire Hutley (WCC), Neil McGill (EA), Cathy Higgins (sub for TB), Rob Ellis (sub for TB), Lizzie Bailes (on behalf of Kathryn Eames, MKC)

Arrived at 12pm: Cllr Donna Fuller, Diane Webber (MKC)

Apologies: Cllr John Orr, Cliff Green (TB), Kathryn Eames (MKC)

Absent: Cllr Len Bagnall, Cllr Joyce Hall, Cllr Brian Walker, Cath Pantling (BH)

Meeting commenced at 11:10am

Roundtable introductions

NP 20/15 – Nomination & election of Chair

- Cllr Sue Smith nominated by Cllr Kevin Wilson, seconded by Cllr Pauline Prop voted in by majority

ELECTED AND APPROVED

NP 21/15 – Residential representatives

- New Eaglestone Residents Association is in the final process of formation, sent Neil McGill as first representative. Hope to have formal representative by January 2017
- VB will send information about the Neighbourhood Plan to Cllr Jordan Coventry (Vice Chair) to disseminate to the Residents Association and potential representatives
- YT has been speaking to a resident who may be interested in becoming the Leadenhall representative. Could not come to this meeting due to work obligations. Hope to have formal representation by January 2017
- YT and other are working to establish a Coffee Hall representative. TBD

NOTED

NP 22/15 – Approve minutes of last Steering Group meeting

- Held on 21 October 2015

ACCEPTED AND APPROVED

NP 23/15 – Clarification RE: Land Budget (lead by Neil Homer, rCOH)

- A land budget is measured not in financial terms but in area (Hectare and square metres) and is used to calculate how much land there is in a given area and what different use it is or will be put to.
- The land budget is often used where there is expected to be a mix of land uses & allows for different configurations of land use mix to be summarized. It is helpful in the early stage of the project to know the implications of different decisions made on arranging land uses.
- At Woughton, land budgeting might help us to understand not just what new land use mixes might look like in general terms, but also to relate them to what exists now. This may enable local people to compare various different land use mix options and to assess what they like and dislike about them.
- In this context our intention would only be to use it at the very general level so we can see the bigger picture. It is not necessary for the decisions the Neighbourhood Plan needs to take for the plans and numbers to be precisely drawn and accurately calculated.
- NH confirmed that draft land budgets had been prepared for the whole area and these may be used later in the project, depending on how the next stage proceeds (Note: he also suggested we use the term 'land use classification map' rather than 'land budget' to avoid any confusion)
- KW noted that it is in no way a proposal, rather a comparing tool to help us make choices for our community

NOTED

NP 24/15 – Update on Neighbourhood Plan project plan and status (lead by Victoria Binko, WCC)

- Went through November 2015 Summary Report
- VB instructed the Steering Group to read through the Housing Advice & Assessment Report fully (or at least the Executive Summary and Table 21) in preparation for the next meeting.
- YT suggested that a diverse housing mix is needed
- JB pointed out that some housing developments do not work for this area (example Ashland)
- NH indicated that this was a good piece of research for the Steering Group to consider, but to keep in mind that this is typically a city level analysis but done at the Parish level

NOTED

DW and DF joined the meeting at 12:00pm

NP 25/15 – Update on first round of consultation results (lead by Victoria Binko, WCC)

- VB summarized first round of consultation from Household and Online Surveys, resident workshops, schools, Sheltered Accommodations etc.
- VB will prepare summary documents to be released before the end of the New Year (one to summarize the entire 4 month comment period including feedback levels and separate documents summarizing each of the outreach events)

- KW suggested to focus on engaging the Black and Ethnic Minority population; can reach out to Trubys Garden Community Centre, faith groups etc.
- Noted the recent Tinkers Bridge Community Action Plan work and its findings will be incorporated into the wider consultation feedback for the Neighbourhood Plan

NOTED

BREAK FOR LUNCH (12:30pm – 1:00pm)

Meeting resumed at 1:00pm

NP 26/15 – Discussion about Issues & Futures Document and next stage of development

- It was agreed that Woughton is unique in MK: it is a very large parish, it occupies a strategic location in the city on its main north-south and east-west corridors and four of its seven estates have been chosen for inclusion in the Regeneration MK programme
- This means that there are issues that the Plan can grapple with that would not be possible in other parts of the city
- Next stage of development: write and release an Issues & Futures Document for public comment (will kick start second round of consultation)
 - o Will outline the many possibilities Woughton has for its future as well as their respective pros and cons, the goal being to stimulate more discussion and critical thinking in a more focused way than the previous consultation period that was very open ended by design.
 - o Think of it as Woughton being at a crossroads, with different routes it can take. In order to determine the best route the community will look at the document to give a view on their preferences and the steering group will also look to community consultation results for guidance on which path the local people want to take.
- A round table discussion was held where each member pointed out one pro and one con for any of the possible futures
 - 1) Refurbishment: the Regeneration MK programme focuses on repairs and maintenance with only small scale redevelopment
 - o Pros:
 - Opportunity to solve current problems or issues in estates through repairs and maintenance of existing houses
 - Maintains large areas of open space and distinctive 'MK' feel of the area
 - Provides for people already living in the estates first before allowing more people into area (keep social network, especially for those who need assistance i.e. carers)
 - There will be enough capacity within the hospital site to meet its expansion needs in the short-term and medium-term
 - The total population and mix won't change so there will be no need for additional school places or other public services

- Cons:
 - The refurbishment programme will not likely have the funds to invest in non-housing improvements, e.g. new facilities, shops, so the money will have to come from somewhere else
 - This may not turn around the relative decline in the area or the way it is perceived from the outside as a place to live
 - The relatively small number of facilities is unlikely to change and bus services are unlikely to be any better
 - There will be no land for an expansion of the hospital or other medical services in the longer-term or for a new secondary school if the proposed new school at Kent's Hill is not enough for this part of the city

- 2) Redevelopment: the Regeneration MK programme comprises refurbishment of some estates but the comprehensive redevelopment of the others
 - Pros:
 - As above for the refurbished areas
 - For the redeveloped areas, the opportunity to have a higher quality and wider range of housing (but need to be able to meet the needs of the current community) to increase the local population and increase its diversity
 - Opportunity for more and better shops, community facilities, schools and business premises within the estates
 - Could lead to less antisocial behavior as proven by success in other areas
 - Might open up lane for expansion of the hospital or a new secondary school depending on where it is
 - Cons:
 - As above for refurbished areas
 - For the redeveloped areas, there will be major disruption with the risk that social networks will be lost as the existing communities are broken up
 - Much of the new housing will become unaffordable to the local community if there are no tenancy guarantees
 - New houses and flats have much smaller rooms and gardens than what is already there
 - The area will look like any other city and not feel like being part of 'MK' any more
 - Too many new residents might be at the expense of the local population if local services are not improved at the same time
 - Higher housing densities will lead to the loss of green spaces
 - May lead to the thinking that some estates got left behind (e.g. why didn't that happen on my estate)

- 3) Transformation: the Regeneration MK programme comprises the comprehensive redevelopment of all four of the estates
 - Pros:
 - As above for redeveloped areas

- Opportunity to increase the local economy and quality of housing on a larger scale
- More funds generated from the development would be reinvested in the community
- Opportunity to re-organise streets and spaces to make them more user friendly and improve safety
- Cons:
 - Major disruption for many years
 - Re-organising streets and spaces may not be in keeping with what makes MK special as a unique city
 - Community spirit may be harmed so much that it never recovers
- Completed document should be ready for February 2016. To be discussed in more detail at the next Steering Group meeting.

NP 27/15 – Agree on date for next meeting

- 26 January 2016, 10:00am – 1:00pm venue TBD