

Emberton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
(A sub committee of Emberton Parish Council)
Minutes of Meeting held virtually – 21st July 2020

Present: Jason Bevan- Chairman
 Joe Walker – Vice Chairman
 Melanie Duncan
 Colin Jamieson

Peter Beer – MKC Assets Team

Peter Geary – Ward Councillor
 Chris Akrill – Town Planning Service
 Karen Goss – Clerk to EPC

1. **Apologies for Absence** – Apologies for Absence were received from Fred Markland.
2. **Declarations of Interest in items on the Agenda** - There were no Declarations of Interest in items on the Agenda.
3. **To approve the Minutes of the Meeting held on the 16th June 2020** – The Minutes of the previous Meeting held on the 16th June 2020 were agreed. The clerk to provide the Minutes to the Chairman for signing. **Action: KG**
4. **Public comments, questions or representations** – There were no members of the public present.
5. **Update from Peter Beer, MKC property services** – Peter commented that he was the assets lead at MKC responsible for the commercial property portfolio and asset management and that he would talk through a couple of the sites owned by MKC within the parish.

School field – Peter B stated that the school had been closed for sometime now and was technically within the control of the education department; there was a covenant on the school building which must be kept for school use. The school field was not affected by the covenant. The next thing would be to apply to the Secretary of State to release the field for development. Jason asked if it was a viable site for the group to consider. Peter B stated that it was. Jason responded that the group would not want to encroach on the school and it would only be a proportion of the field. Peter B stated that it would be more viable if it was just a proportion of the field. Chris asked if it would put the group in a better position if part of the field was left. Peter B responded that this was the case. Jason asked how much of the field would be used. Chris stated that the ratio was 30 dwellings per hectare. Peter G commented that a development of 11 dwellings would take about a third of the site; the site would have to be looked at in terms of wildlife and the pond. Chris responded that the situation with newts was supposed to be getting easier. Peter G stated that there was also a tree planted on the site as a memorial to one of the students. Chris stated

that some of the land for a car park for the village would be a bonus. Melanie stated that the school field was the preferred site at the outset and it would sit well with the village.

Field 13 – Peter B commented that this site was split into two sections; one site which was planted as a bio diversity area and the other which was currently rented for sheep grazing. The right hand side of the site was ridge and furrow and was a good example of this in the area and there might be some planning issues with this. Jason asked if the group would get planning for this. Peter B responded that ridge and furrow was more difficult. Peter G commented that there was a sewer that ran diagonally across field 13. Peter B stated that the advice would be to get early engagement with the planning team. Chris responded that the group needed to think about how field 13 related to the rest of the village and whether the site would deliver the same amount of development as the school field. Peter G commented that he was unsure how close to the A509 the school field could be developed. Peter B explained the process of how the school site would come forward with the assets team taking the proposal to children’s services and then the approach to the Secretary of State. Colin asked if the trees in the school field had to be taken into account as he was aware of a mulberry tree on the site. Peter B responded only if they had TPO’s on them. Peter G commented that the conservation area might cover part of the field and this needed to be looked at; trees could be included in part of the area that was being developed. Working with MKC as land owners would enable the village to have a say in what development it wanted. MKC had to seek best value for its assets. Chris commented that Peter B would probably need to submit the site to the group to consider so that it could be assessed against all the other sites. **Action: CA** to forward the Call for Sites proforma to the clerk to send to Peter B. Jason asked if anyone had any particular views on the two sites. The clerk responded that the parish council had discussed parking in Hulton Drive at the recent parish council meeting with a view of introducing a resident’s parking scheme. Joe responded that he believed the school field site to be more suitable and inclusive and could possibly help with parking. It was noted that both sites needed to be considered against the criteria for the other sites put forward. Peter G responded that the only issue with the school field was the A509 from an environmental health point of view, the other was around the school which was still owned by MKC. There were advantages and disadvantages to both sites. Chris commented that the group could go out to consultation with residents on both sites. Taking into account the comment made regarding the A509 and noise; there was acoustic fencing and houses could be positioned so that they were not adversely affected. **Post meeting note** – school part of conservation area but not school field.

6. **Agree updated vision statement** – Jason had previously emailed an updated vision statement. It was proposed by Joe, seconded by Colin and unanimously agreed that the following vision statement be adopted: “To maintain Emberton as a thriving community, preserving and where possible enhancing the rural character and special identity of Emberton, whilst allowing the parish to evolve in a way that reflects the community’s needs and wishes, both now and in the future.”
7. **Review of sites put forward** – This will happen when the two additional sites were put forward. Chris stated that there might need to be a review of the settlement boundary in terms of back gardens and the other side of the A509. Jason responded that he understood that the boundary was extended because of the Acorn Nursery site. Chris responded that the view the group took before was to encompass both

sides of the village. **Action: CA** to look at this.

8. **Housing Needs Assessment refresh** – CA had circulated this prior to the meeting which indicated an allocation of 10 dwellings and was more in line with the first survey completed by residents.
9. **Affordable Housing Options** – The clerk reported that the discussion with EUC had been positive.
10. **Next steps** – Call for sites proforma to Peter Beer. **Action: CA/KG** Chris commented that he had a discussion with David Blandamer and he felt that the group needed to re-run the Article 14 consultation as the housing number had changed and also seek comments on the two sites. Putting both sites into the plan was a good idea, making it clear that it was an either/or option. Due to Covid 19, it was not possible to consult in the same way but the plan needed to be printed out and circulated to those that could not access it online. Peter G commented that the way around this was to hold an outdoor event at the pavilion using the marquee and a booking system to restrict numbers. The clerk reported that a good opportunity for public engagement was the church fete being held in the playing field on the 5th September. Chris commented that once the plan was made public again there was a six week window for consultation and comments. Following this, the group would make any changes to the plan and it would then be submitted to MKC again under Article 15 and out for consultation for another six weeks. Jason asked if the plan could be worked on in the meantime and asked who would do this. Chris responded that this was possible and something he would do. Melanie made reference to light pollution and asked if there was a policy on this that could be included in the plan. Chris responded that there was an encouragement of dark skies and shielded lighting. Jason made reference to the noise from the A509 and asked if this was within the parish council's remit. Chris stated that there could be a policy regarding noise and the A509 but was unsure how this could be delivered. Peter G commented that it was a decision that had to be made by MKC, speeding could be looked at through SIDs or VAS equipment. Peter G stated that linking the two sides of the A509 was something that should happen, with improvements at the junction. As much of the funding from the development of the site should come back to the community.
11. **Any other business** – Grant – **Action: CA/KG**

Acorn Nurseries – It was agreed to put the plan together and then engage with Acorn Nurseries. Peter stated that MKC arguably had a 5 year land supply which meant that the site would not come forward.
12. **Date of next virtual meeting** – Thursday 3rd September 2020 at 7pm

The meeting closed at 8pm