

# Emberton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

## (A committee of Emberton Parish Council)

### Minutes of Meeting held virtually – 14<sup>th</sup> December 2020

**Present:**

Jason Bevan - Chairman  
Fred Markland – Vice Chairman  
Melanie Duncan  
Colin Jamieson

Mr Warwick Clarke – Emberton United Charity

Chris Akrill – Town Planning Service

Karen Goss – Clerk

1. **Apologies for Absence** – Apologies for Absence were received from Virginia McTierney.
2. **Appointment of Vice Chairman** – Jason reported that Joe had stepped down from the committee and he wished him all the best. It was proposed by Jason, seconded by Melanie and unanimously agreed that Fred be appointed Vice Chairman.
3. **Declarations of Interest in items on the Agenda** - There were no Declarations of Interest in items on the Agenda.
4. **To approve the Minutes of the Meeting held on the 17<sup>th</sup> November 2020** – The Minutes of the previous Meeting held on the 17<sup>th</sup> November 2020 were agreed. The clerk to provide the Minutes to the Chairman for signing at the next face to face meeting.
5. **Public comments, questions or representations** – There were no public present.
8. **Institute Policy** – Chris stated that he was putting in an allocation at The Institute as part of the plan policy with a suggested figure of 3-4 dwellings. Warwick responded that the EUC had not really thought of any allocation as such but had initial thoughts about using the meeting room as a residential unit because it was currently under used but the site could possibly suit 3-4 flat typedwellings. Total redevelopment of possibly one or two houses was not the plans of the EUC and any development would be for single people. The EUC’s present accommodation was on long term let and there was no sign that tenants wished to move. Chris commented that any suggested wording of the policy should make it as flexible as possible so that it would meet current and future requirements without setting any timescale. The policy would include wording that any new housing would be available to people that had a connection with the village. Warwick responded that this was very much EUC’s policy but the only conflict was the parking situation. Chris stated that MKC’s parking standard for one bedroomed units was only one parking space per unit. It was noted that some residents of The Forge parked outside The Institute and there were historical problems with buses. Chris responded that thought needed to

be given as to how this could be resolved with a solution possibly being creating additional parking in the entrance to the school playing field. Melanie asked if The Institute had parking allocated against it as a public building which it could draw on for parking spaces. Chris responded that if the building wasn't being used, taking that away helped the village parking situation.

Warwick stated that the EUC would need to form their own policy and there were financial considerations. Prior to Covid, The Institute was paying its own way but there was a bit of a conflict with The Pavilion. It was noted that The Institute was slightly bigger than The Pavilion and also had a high ceiling, which would allow conversion to units. Chris stated that a suggestion would be to divide the building along its length and put room space into a mezzanine floor. Warwick responded that the meeting room had a floor above it which was currently used as storage. Chris asked if EUC would be adverse to a policy in the plan regarding The Institute. Warwick responded that it was EUC's wish to have the option of looking further at the conversion route. Jason asked if this was the whole of The Institute. Warwick responded that initially it would be the meeting room so that the rest of the building could function as a hall. Fred asked about the demand for single units and the enquiries that had been forthcoming. Warwick stated that there were 3 generations of families in the village and the grandchildren were now wanting single units. Chris stated that the plan could include something along the lines of "supporting the concept and idea". Melanie suggested that the wording could state "development in whole or in part."

Mr Clarke left the meeting following this agenda item.

6. **Update on School field** – Chris reported that, other than his discussion with David Blandamer, there had not been an update on the school field and it was unlikely that it would be put forward by MKC in any way. Jason stated that the Acorn Early Years discussion had intimated some potential for parking and asked if it was something that could be included in the plan. Chris responded that this could be included in the plan as an aspiration. There was also the option of creating some parking near the sub station in the High Street, by creating a line of informal gravel parking without using the playing field at all. Jason asked how the group would write this into the plan. Chris responded that the plan could state that areas for parking were being investigated.
7. **Agree amended Settlement Boundary** – Chris commented that he had taken the settlement boundary to the paddock field in Gravel Walk. Fred stated that the little red dot shown as The Institute could be enlarged to encompass the whole of the site. It was noted that the proposals map had completely been drawn. It was proposed by Jason, seconded by Melanie and unanimously agreed that the settlement boundary be approved with the minor amendment of The Institute.
8. **Agree changes to V6 of the Neighbourhood Plan** – Chris commented that he had reworked the housing chapter of the plan and would put all the comments into the plan in the next couple of weeks. Melanie commented that the parish council would more than likely wish to engage with developers before planning applications were made. Fred responded that if there was to be a large size development, it would be good for the parish council to engage with developers but this was not being promoted through the plan and suggested that the plan be worded so that any developers would have to engage with the community. Melanie commented that the

plan showed both the options for the bypass and MK2050 was only showing the option to the west of Emberton. Chris responded that this was something that had been looked at previously but there was no question of it in terms of funding. It was in MK2050 as a long-term aspiration but that would be past the end of the neighbourhood plan. The question was raised as to whether there should be reference to the bypass. Jason asked if the plan would have any control over it. Fred responded that there was a need to have the bypass shown at the start of the plan as it could have affected the choice of development sites but this was not now the case. It was agreed that there was no need to include the bypass options; by its inclusion, it would seem that the group accepted it. Melanie stated that section 11.5 of the plan referred to transport and highways and included a section on the bus route. Chris responded that he would reword this to reflect potential development of The Institute and parking issues and that the idea of the gravel parking in the High Street needed looking into a bit more. Melanie responded that the parish council were looking at residents parking schemes around the country park to alleviate parking problems in the village.

**Institute Policy** – This has been covered above.

**Windfall development policy** – Chris responded that this had been covered in the plan and with the way it had been worded, affordable development would be preferred option.

**Conservation Area Statement** – Chris stated that he now had the Conservation Area Statement from Fred and there were things in the document that could be brought across into the plan. There had previously been a discussion within the steering group to update the Conservation Area Statement to reflect Plan:MK and the NPPF and Chris felt that this was something that MKC should be doing. Fred asked if some of the more salient points could be included in the plan such as trees and landscape. Chris commented that the parish council could have a tree survey done. Fred responded that MKC should do this as part of their conservation area review.

9. **Next steps – Public consultation – process and timeline** – Melanie stated that the plan needed to be presented to the parish council for approval prior to public consultation. It was noted that the consultation process would probably run between January and March and a further 8 weeks for MKC to make (end April) followed by the examination stage. It was noted that the referendum might therefore be June or July 2021.
10. **Any other business – Grant** – The clerk to look into this. Action: KG
11. **Date of next virtual meeting** – Tuesday 5<sup>th</sup> January 2021 at 7pm subject to the parish council meeting changed to the 12<sup>th</sup> January 2021.

The meeting closed at 7.55pm