

Staverton Neighbourhood Development Plan

Consultation Event Notes – 18th Nov 17

PRESENT: Cllr T Glover, Cllr J Gilford, Cllr T Gilford, Cllr M Nightingale,
Cllr I Weaver, Cllr G Edwards

APOLOGIES: Cllr S Frost, Cllr J Golding

GUESTS: Kirkwell Consultants Claire Bradley & Lousie Kirkup

Site (2) Beside the School Stephen Mair - Andrew Grainger & Co
Stuart Smith - Avant Homes

Site (20) Braunston Lane Patrick Reid - DLP Planning Ltd
James Jackson Stops – representing the family

IN ATTENDANCE: 65 residents signed the consultation sign-in document

Doors opened at 9:50, meeting finished at 12:20pm.

- The Chair of the Parish Council (PC) welcomed everybody to the meeting, thanked all present for attending and introduced the invited guests: the PC consultants Kirkwells, who were facilitating this event/assisting the PC in the process of producing a plan and representatives from the two sites being considered for allocation in the plan.
- The chair went on to explain:
 - Kirkwells were there to give technical advice and explain the reasons as to why sites were being considered in the plan so that all could make informed decisions in their consultation responses.
 - The site representatives were there to answer any questions on the indicative proposals put forward in relation to the two sites that have been put forward to be included in the plan.

- In order that the meeting was run constructively, there would be a question and answer sessions at the end once all the guests had spoken.
- That in order that comments could be taken into account and influence the making of the plan, they would be required in writing, advising there was a comment form available for everybody to complete.
- The Parish newsletter, placed on every seat, gave reasons for inclusion and exclusion of sites in a plan and would be delivered to all households in the village in order to ensure everybody had the opportunity to comment.
- The Chair, before handing over to Kirkwells to facilitate the event, gave an overview as to:
 - Where the PC was in the production of the plan.
 - How a Neighbourhood Development Plan can help rural village communities.
 - How the vision for the parish has been derived from the 67% response rate to the Parish Questionnaire.
 - How the plan will be a statutory document that will be incorporated into the Northamptonshire Planning Framework and will be used to determine planning policies.
 - The work that has gone into the process so far: nearly 60 formal meetings: many more informal workshops: consultations with several consultants, representatives from Daventry District Council, landowners & developers, and most importantly, the residents.
- The Chair also advised that all of the working documents / draft statements are on the Parish website and can be viewed including: An introduction to the basic principles of NDP's: The Parish Questionnaire statement that showed the audit trail to the Visions, Goals and Objectives that had been adopted: The Village Confines Statement and Maps: The Important views & Green Spaces Statements: The Site Assessment Statement: The Housing Needs Statement: Consultation Documents: Draft Policies and numerous other Maps
- The Chair went on to further explain:
 - Once the draft plan was ready, that too would be available to view. Those without access to computers should approach a PC member for a hard copy to view.
 - Early on in the process, it was decided to select possible sites for development and a call for sites exercise was undertaken
 - Residents had been asked to indicate where they thought new development could take place and the type and size they thought suitable.
 - The results of the questionnaire clearly stated that the majority of residents wanted the provision of affordable homes and bungalows.
 - In total, 25 sites were suggested including various paddocks, fields, gardens, the site the village hall & even in place of the school.
 - Using the DDC toolkits and taking advice from DDC, the PC was able to reduce this number down to 6 potential sites.
 - Meetings were then held with the landowners and developers of these sites to ascertain if the developments were suitable, available, achievable and ultimately deliverable.
 - A village vote on which of the 3 large sites remaining would be preferable was held and the results were displayed on the noticeboard on the green and the parish website.
 - At this point, the PC also had to take in to account any past planning decisions concerning the sites.

- After lengthy consultations and much discussion, the sites were narrowed down to 3 possible sites.
- In addition to the above, the consultants AECOM undertook an independent assessment and found that two of the six potential sites assessed were appropriate for allocation for housing (site 2 beside the school & site 20 on Braunston Lane).
- A further site (site 4 – at Silver Birch) could be suitable if the identified constraints could be resolved. Also, as this site was nearer the nucleus of the Conservation area, it would have more of an impact on the Conservation area over and above site 2 (next to the school)
- The remaining three smaller sites were not considered suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood plan due to previous planning decisions.
- So, by the end of the process, the PC has come down to the two preferred development sites, guests of whom were here today.
- The Chair then passed the floor over to the consultants who were there to facilitate the event.
- Kirkwells introduced themselves and went on to:
 - Advise about their previous experience in producing neighbourhood plans: to-date they had advised on 150, made 35, and currently had 4 at referendum stage.
 - They congratulated the PC and steering group on the extensive work that had been undertaken to-date, highlighting the amount of consultation that had been undertaken.
 - They explained they had been engaged to assist the PC in completing the process to produce a plan.
 - They would be helping the PC in producing policies for the plan and preparing it for having a Health Check in December before proceeding to Regulation 14 in the New Year.
 - For the referendum to be successful there would need to be a 50% plus one YES vote.
 - They advised there would be further opportunity to comment during the production of the plan.
 - They also explained how the plan is subject to a robust technical process and in order to be made, it would need to meet the basic conditions statement before any examiner could approve it and even then, after an examiner approved it, it was ultimately the residents who decided if the plan be made by way of a referendum
- Kirkwells then went on to explain the benefits of allocating sites in a plan
 - Gives village's direct power to develop and shape the development and growth of their village.
 - Villages are able to choose where they want new homes, and have a say on what those new buildings should look like and what infrastructure should be provided.
 - Allocating sites would ensure the village gets the right types of development as opposed to having to deal with speculative planning applications as and when they were submitted therefore taking a proactive approach as opposed to a reactive approach.
 - It was acknowledged Daventry currently have a five-year land supply of deliverable housing sites. However, should this not prove to be the case in the future, having sites in the plan would protect the village

against any speculative building applications. Villages nearby like Kilsby & Flore, had significantly increased in size because of them not having a made plan in place when DDC did not have a five-year supply.

- Kirkwells then handed over to the representatives of the two sites to talk about their proposals:
- Site 2 representatives (Near the School) explained:
 - How the scheme had developed over the last 4 years i.e. Initially an application had been put in for 47 dwellings that was withdrawn and following extensive consultation with residents, the steering group and the PC, the proposal now was to have 11 units that met the housing need, ie. 4 affordable would be delivered along with smaller dwellings inclusive of bungalows that would enable residents in the village to downsize and next generation families to remain.
 - The site also had the added benefit on offer of a community car park for use of the school, church, and village hall.
 - The site proposal on offer had been directly influenced by residents, the steering group and the PC. As evidence of commitment that the intention was to deliver what the parish wanted the current layout was version four after taking into account the various comments received.
 - They closed their presentation by explaining that, as the process continued, there would be even more opportunity for the villages to influence the site proposals.
 - Site 20 representatives (End of Braunston Lane) explained:
 - They were not as advanced as site two and had yet to engage developers.
 - They had fully engaged with the PC and were here today to get residents comments on proposed layout and ask what residents would like to see.
 - They too had delivered as per the housing need with the site including bungalows and smaller dwellings and an affordable unit.
 - The layout of each house meant there was off-road parking and visitor parking to help address traffic congestion.
 - They had taken advice from Highways who considered there would not be an issue with traffic along Braunston Lane or access off Braunston Lane.
 - Another key element of the design they hoped to achieve was that the small development would fit into the character of the village.
 - The intention was to submit an outline planning application.
 - All were advised that the people involved in the development of this site had been ‘born and bred’ in Staverton and very much wanted to give something back to the community by way of delivering a site that would enable the village need to be addressed and meet with the aesthetics of the village and asked for all to feed their comments back as to what they wanted.
 - Kirkwells thanked both sites for their presentation and explained the intention of today was that residents could ask questions to gain understanding and

clarity of what the impact of including sites in the plan would be, and what the site proposals were. All were then asked to submit their comments in writing in order each point could be looked at and addressed.

- A suggestion from the floor was that questions/comments specific to the sites were taken first and then questions on the intention to include sites in order that the two matters did not become confusing which was agreed

Question	Comment
Supported site by the school as it took traffic away from the junction at Glebe Lane and the access was from Daventry Road	
Suggested the car park was nearer the school	This was still the consultation period, the car park had already had three locations, there was an option to bring the car park nearer the school as the plan was still in the consultation process
Was concerned the site in Braunston Lane would increase traffic congestion	The site had been designed with off street car parking and there was an area of visitor car parking to address this
The developers were asked if the garages on the sites would be large enough to get a car into that allowed sufficient space to get in and out of the car	It was pointed out that the developers would have to build as per the policies in the plan so if the PC decided that garages must be of a specific size then they would have the option to include a specific size in the site policy
What would the price range of the houses be	It could not be determined at this stage of the process as there were many considerations yet to be taken into account
As the site was outside the village confines would there be a section 106 agreement put in place Could the proposal to have a local connection be included in the S106 agreement	Yes Yes
Who would incur the maintenance costs going forward in relation to the car park, would the Parish precept be increased? Do the developers think there will be a material change in parking in and around the school if a car park was provided? A recent park and stride scheme had not worked as it had relied on participation/engagement of the parents Do they consider the car park could be a ‘white elephant’?	The detail had yet to be discussed but there were various options: The S106 would cover the first five years of maintenance costs A management company could be set up so that ongoing maintenance costs would be funded by the development itself in order there was no cost incurred by the Parish. The PC could take on the liability of maintenance costs through the precept All acknowledged the car park in itself was not the solution, but it was considered by

<p>How many proposed spaces were there?</p>	<p>working with the school/parents the provision of a car park with engagement from the school could help address the traffic problem</p> <p>Currently there were twenty car parking places but this could be changed as the consultation process was still in progress.</p>
<p>Why were Avant Homes who were known to have a history of developing larger sites interested in taking forward a smaller site?</p> <p>Why would Avant Homes not sign a heads of Terms?</p> <p>Could there be a design code produced that the developers would have to sign up to?</p>	<p>Avant Homes is ultimately a housebuilder and have established themselves locally with sites in Kilsby, Daventry, and Flore. Ultimately, they are interested in housebuilding itself regardless of size with an aim to become the home builder of choice locally. It was explained that any Heads of Terms would have to be with Daventry District Council and not the development committee or the PC.</p> <p>It was also considered a Heads of Terms was not necessary, as Avant were a progressive, responsible homebuilder, who has a commitment to the communities they build in, and the people that live within them.</p> <p>There would be a number of opportunities going forward for the proposal to be influenced by way of the policies contained in the plan therefore it was also considered there was not a need for a Heads of Terms document as ultimately, they would have to deliver what was in the policies.</p> <p>The polices of the plan would in effect be the design code.</p>
<p>Both site allocations are in open countryside and in the special landscape area</p> <p>DDC has met its rural housing supply and has stock for the next five years.</p>	<p>The Housing Need for Staverton is deemed to be fifteen and there are no sites within the confines that could facilitate a development of fifteen. The plan is for the next 12 years and therefore, if sites are selected, there is another level of protection to protect you for the next 12 years.</p>

	<p>There is a risk in the future that due to developments not going ahead then this figure could fall below again which would open the village to the risk of sites being granted planning permission.</p>
<p>The biggest fear is once a development is included in the plan, what happens next, will it escalate? Say there is a change in government resulting in a change in policy the plan could ‘open the doors’ for a lot more development</p> <p>Everybody agrees a plan is needed</p> <p>Everybody agrees more houses are needed</p> <p>Is the answer not to elect representatives to Daventry District Council to address the issue, and not attempt to deal with it at a local level – site allocation is a highly contentious issue</p>	<p>The plan period is up to 2029, no further development above that included within the plan would be permitted, this is how strong a local plan is. Since 1949 there had been no planning decision made without reference to the local plan</p> <p>What may happen in the future is not a reason not to do something now</p> <p>The plan is the villages opportunity to set out what they want in the plan/village</p>
<p>What happens after today</p>	<p>All the written comments received from today will be looked at, analysed and conclusions drawn. The plan will then be amended accordingly. This approach allows residents the opportunity to genuinely influence the plan.</p> <p>There would also be two more formal rounds of consultation to allow further comments to be considered.</p> <p>Notes from the presentation today would be available on the website</p> <p>After today's event every household in the village would receive a copy of the newsletter and be given the opportunity to comment</p> <p>It was important all comments whether positive or negative were put in writing</p>
<p>Some felt there had not been enough consultation on the plan and that publishing articles and giving presentations was a ‘talk to approach’ as opposed to an ‘engagement approach’.</p>	<p>The PC had been commended by Kirkwells on the amount of consultation that had been undertaken. Today's event was over and above what was required by way of example, as a considerable amount of consultation had already been undertaken and there were two more formal consultation events to present as part of the plan making process. The purpose of holding events was</p>

<p>The decision to have sites included within the plan had been carried by just one vote and of other local plans, only one plan had chosen to include sites.</p>	<p>to ignite comment. However, only written comments whether positive or negative could be taken into account.</p> <p>Cllr Weaver expressed his concern at the comment that no consultation had taken place. Every month the PC met to discuss the plan and the audience attendance at the open meetings was normally only a handful of people. He pleaded, as did Cllr Edwards, if people really want to be involved in the plan making process, they attend the PC meetings.</p> <p>Kirkwells had worked on the other local plans and advised several of them had intended to include sites but due to the process of making a plan taking so long the developers had submitted applications and had them approved before the plan was made therefore there was not a need to include sites. Also, others had had so much development already there was not a need to include sites.</p> <p>The Chair advised Badby had not included sites because the only site they would have considered appropriate was not available, deliverable or achievable as the land owner did not want to develop the site at this time.</p>
<p>The issue was raised that there were fundamental concerns with the site selection.</p>	<p>Kirkwells pointed all to the independent site assessment that had been undertaken by AECOM as evidence that the site (s) put forward were appropriate, advising that this was another example of where the PC had gone ‘over and above’ what was required of them as many plan makers did not opt for an independent assessment.</p>
<p>Why can the plan not allow for any development.</p>	<p>A plan has to be sustainable for it to be approved by the examiner, and the approach to have no development is not sustainable. A plan can allow for small scale development but it cannot say no development.</p>
<p>Why does the plan have to include sites, other development has occurred on an ad-hoc basis over the years (Churchfields / Windmill gardens)?However, it was agreed the village</p>	<p>There is no reason why a plan has to select sites, but by selecting sites the village is selecting where build will occur in the future and what build will occur. The sites given as</p>

What are the implications in connection with rural allocation in the emerging DDC Settlements & Countryside Local Plan?	The document has only just been published and has yet to be read and ‘fully digested’ so that the PC could comment formally on its contents and impact on the village.
---	--

- The Chair advised:
 - some of you may be aware, DDC have been working on their Settlements & Countryside Local Plan (Pt 2).
 - This lays out the District Councils proposals for development within the district in the coming years.
 - As of yesterday, the Draft consultation document has now been made public & is available for inspection and comment.
 - It runs to several hundred pages but there are a couple of sections that are relevant to this meeting.
 - Within the consultation the proposal is to no longer have HS22 in its current format.
 - HS22 had previously been known as the restricted infill policy and applied to Staverton
 - The consultation document proposes that this is replaced by a settlement hierarchy of Primary Service Villages, Secondary Service Villages, other Villages and Settlement/Hamlets.
 - Staverton have in effect ‘gone up a level’ and are now considered to be a secondary service village. Under the definition, any village in this category, although having a limited range of services, provides scope to meet local needs for housing, employment and service provisions.
 - As a secondary village, consideration will be given to having a balanced housing stock/need and as with Primary Service Villages there may be scope for development outside the confines of the village
 - It was suggested that all go away and look at DDC’s consultation document before making an individual decision prior to submitting a comment in relation to whether to include sites or not in the Staverton plan.
 - It has been suggested that we could ignore selecting sites and let DDC & developers decide. The committee had expected challenge and controversy on this issue but we considered this would be ‘outweighed’ by the many benefits in undertaking this task. Not selecting sites weakens the control and reduces the input from Staverton residents.
 - By selecting specific sites, the PC are able to ensure that the right mix of housing is achieved as identified in both the PC and the DDC Housing Needs Surveys.
 - Yes, DDC have met their 5-year land supply requirements and, at present, are not planning any forced development in the smaller villages. However, in the current uncertain climate, this could change.
 - As you may be aware, there are plans to more than double the size of Daventry Town (related to the Flore and Weedon bypass).
 - Also, because we are within 3 miles of Daventry town, the village will probably be affected by their expansion plans (look at Welton).

- It's been proposed that we can control any proposed development using policies alone as other parishes have done. However, policies alone do not have the same influence / clout as defined pre-selected sites.
- One of the reasons the PC were in favour of having sites in the plan was so they could control where development occurs, there was always the threat as had happened with other villages (Welton, Norton) that as Staverton were so close to Daventry, they could become engulfed in Daventry's proposals to expand and that it was a better strategic decision for the PC to include sites in the plan albeit contentious, especially as we fall within the Milton Keynes development area.

- **The Chair also highlighted that:**

- It will take some time for the consultation process and final adoption of the DDC plan.
- Parish councils who are able to submit their Neighbourhood Development Plan before the Local Plan is adopted will be able to claim prior influence and the Local Plan must be adapted to suit.
- We are in the fortunate position that our plan is almost ready to submit and, barring any unforeseen delays, the Staverton Plan will become legally adopted before the DDC Local Plan does.
- Therefore, I and the PC would urge you to consider the implications of this new development as it will seriously affect the future of our village.