

Notes from meeting with Archstone 28/9/16

Attendees

Watlington NP:-

Ian Hill (PC), Gill Bindoff (NPCoG), Jeremy Bell (Chair SC), Norman Perry (NPCoG), Tony Powell (NPCoG); Rachel Gill (NP Admin), Tom Bindoff (SC), Terry Jackson (SC), Peter Richardson (NP Admin)

Archstone:-

Jonathan Porter (Archstone), Matthew Gough (Archstone), Jason Hill (Savills), James de Havilland (Barton Willmore)
Max Thurgood (Clarke Bond)

1. Introductions

GB welcomed the team from Archstone, stating that this would be an informal, without prejudice meeting and introduced the NP team. Archstone introduced themselves.

2. Neighbourhood Plan Update

GB gave an update on progress since the last meeting in July. The aim had been to produce a draft plan by the start of September. Unfortunately this is now likely to be November.

Traffic Modelling

The main cause of the delay has been funding for traffic modelling, a Locality grant for £4.5k has now been received but all the quotes have been much higher than this. Also the scope of work funded by Locality is only impact assessment of sites and not modelling of traffic management strategies such as chicanes and traffic lights. The NP team have spent a lot of time liaising with OCC and SODC to examine opportunities for help with this modelling. Further funding from SODC has now been agreed.

The introduction of the possible development at Chalgrove has added complexity and delay. Further discussion with HCA is planned for next week.

Site Assessment

TP gave an update on progress with site assessment. Availability was 23 sites with 4 small sites which would not be allocated in the NP but would be assessed on their merits should an application be submitted, and 2 sites in Pyrton which can be assessed but not allocated.

Sites have had a full assessment with 3 stages of validation and also been compared to the Sustainability Objectives from Consultation 2 and 'What Watlington Wants' document. This information is ready to be presented to the Steering Group but awaiting the traffic modelling outputs. The analysis is broad and based

Commented [IH1]:

on a traffic light system. The end objective is a summary paragraph for each site covering constraints and benefits.

TP advised that a new flood map has just been published and this had been included, he asked whether Archstone had used this ?

MT said that the 1:1000yr floodline was used as well as co-ordinates from the Environment Agency.

JP checked that the document Archstone sent with information on Site criteria has been included, TP confirmed it has.

HCA / Chalgrove

PR gave an update on the Chalgrove situation, saying that there have been around 7000 responses from local communities in opposition to the scheme. The NP team met with the HCA recently and plan to meet again next week as the NP need to understand what is planned, particularly in terms of infrastructure. The HCA are looking at traffic strategically so the NP are keen to establish what information can be gathered from them.

There was a general discussion on changes to legislation for NPs and current events in NPs including that NPs have no legal status if there is no adopted Local Plan.

JB asked about speed of build, as just having development sites did not necessarily equate to houses.

JP and MG assured the group that most Archstone projects locally are built out or very close to it and that the site discussed could be built out in the required window.

MT explained some of the constraints which often hold up development of sites, e.g. infrastructure and highways.

3. Update on Proposals

GB asked JP to give an update on the proposals for WAT11/12.

JdeH said that more work had been done on floodline and drainage and flood mitigation.

He handed round some updated drawings of the site. The key points of note being :

- An increase in the number of dwellings to 183
- Planned road width of 7.3m, this will allow 2 buses to pass
- Road route planned with bends to slow traffic
- Mix of dwellings as per SODC preferred mix
- Two large green spaces – possible uses including recreation area, allotments, wetland/nature area

There was some discussion over cars on site, parking for visitors, size of gardens and cycle parking. Access was also discussed with MT stating the best route to Cuxham road is the existing road which joins at the roundabout. The NP asked about whether this would still be the case if WAT10 were developed with an alternative route? MT felt it would but the roundabout would need to be made bigger to accommodate an extra road joining it.

4. Opportunities for Improvement to Community Facilities

Public Open Spaces : Informal recreation, play spaces, orchards, allotments etc

Archstone outlined options for use of green spaces on the site. NP felt this was positive as the site is a long way from the Rec and an additional play area/recreation areas would be an asset. Other uses such as a community orchard were also seen as positive.

Improvements to Britwell Road Pedestrian Links

GB asked if Archstone would contribute to traffic calming measures and improving pedestrian access. JP said that this is already being worked on with some plans for improving footways on Britwell Road and that footpaths would be put in place around the roundabout on Cuxham Road as this would most likely be the main route into town from the site.

Other on or off site facilities or improvements ?

GB asked whether workshop/start-up units could be included?

Archstone said this could be looked at.

NP asked whether there could be a few plots allocated for self build?

Archstone felt that 2-3 plots for self-build would be possible.

5. Next Steps / AOB / Questions

JB spoke about the importance of space between houses and expressed concern over how a busy road through an estate would work. JdeH explained how the road would be designed for function and that the design of this type of 'boulevard' could cope with a throughput of up to 20,000 units per day.

IH expressed his concern over not linking up the roads and ending up with a lot of houses and no alternative route. There was some discussion over WAT8,9,10. Archstone made it clear that the intention was that the proposed through road could be part of a "relief road" connected up through WAT 8, although they stressed that they had no jurisdiction over the issue.

Next Steps

GB asked when a Planning Application would be submitted for the site?

JP said that the next step would be a public consultation in December.

It was agreed to liaise over highways issues as IH said OCC had agreed to make changes to Britwell Road but they have not yet happened.