

Notes from meeting with Providence Land 10/10/16

Attendees

Watlington NP:-

Gill Bindoff (NPCoG), Ian Hill (PC), Tony Powell (NPF Traffic Group), Rachel Gill (NP Admin), Tom Bindoff (SC), Terry Jackson (SC), Peter Richardson (NP Admin)

Providence Land

Jonathan Harbottle, Tom Hutchinson, Jeremy Emerson

1. Update on progress of Watlington NP

Gill Bindoff (GB) gave an update on Watlington NP.

Progress has been slower than planned due to hold ups on funding for traffic modelling and also the introduction of Chalgrove as a strategic site.

JH asked about the scope of the modelling work.

GB said it wasn't a case of redoing the TPP work from 2014 but to model options, impact of sites and traffic management options for the town centre. Chalgrove has also delayed progress. The NP team have met with the HCA twice and will meet them again with other local parishes on 31st October.

Tony Powell (TP) gave an update on the site selection process.

The sites group are ready to submit initial recommendations on sites. 23 sites have been assessed, this includes two in Pyrton parish (Wat7 & 8) and a number of small sites. 17 sites have had a full assessment, including assessment against sustainability and 'What Watlington Wants & Doesn't Want'. TJ is writing up a summary for each site. Completion of this process is just waiting for traffic input.

TH asked whether the site assessments are independent from those of Pyrton Neighbourhood Plan and whether a location within Watlington Parish was an assessment criterion?

IH said that yes the assessments have been undertaken separately to those of Pyrton Neighbourhood Plan and all assessments were done equally although whether it is in the parish is taken into account.

He also said there is a lack of clarity from SODC on how development of WAT 8 contributes to Watlington's allocation. TH said that the policy officers at SODC had confirmed that a location beyond the Parish boundary did not necessarily prevent the site from contributing to Watlington's allocation.

TH asked whether SODC had firmed up the numbers of houses Watlington would be allocated?

GB said no but the latest position is 10% of current number of houses in addition to the last numbers. For Watlington this would be 79+120 so around 200.

GB said that the NP are trying to meet with representatives of Wat 10 and asked if PL had met them ?

PL have met with Wat 10 representatives and discussed with them the possibility of developing Wat9 and using this to fund a road through Wat10. JH went on to explain that the application for Wat 8 went in as the only mechanism to secure development of a key site.

TB asked about access and road widening on Pyrton Lane given the restriction of trees on the Shirburn Estate side of the road.

JH will check on this.

2. Wat 8 Application

PR asked for the PL view on comments received on their application.

TH said they are waiting on OCC / Highway response and had not added up responses and they would need to see how many are from Pyrton and Watlington.

GB asked whether PL have met with Linden Homes (Wat7)?

JE said that they had met but they wanted to pursue their own standalone scheme and there were no formal agreements in place.

GB went on to express concern over the unsatisfactory nature of having 100 homes and access through to Pyrton lane. JH stated that means of access is 'reserved' in the planning application currently and so still open for discussion. It may be an option to 'cul de sac' the development initially.

TP asked whether 100 houses could fund the site ?

TP said some people were sceptical about such a large site being developed with only 100 homes and Pyrton were concerned over ground water flooding when Thames Water will require funding for waste water and run-off. One of the key questions the NP have been unable to answer is how many houses are needed to fund an alternative route and also the impact of traffic management in the town centre.

JH said that groundwater and drainage have been considered and he will report back. The green spaces can be agreed and made legally binding. He felt that the commercial reality is that a developer will use the PL masterplan and get on with developing, and that having some larger houses on larger plots would make the numbers work.

TH added that the green space/buffer is needed to reduce landscape impact and make the site work in planning terms so that there is never a question of all the site being developed.

GB said that the NP would be asking SODC to tie down the green areas if planning permission is given.

TJ asked about links with the school and recreation ground both of which may need land to expand into.

GB said that the logical place for school expansion is Wat8 and that school may need to expand and are concerned over capacity. JH said there had been some discussions with school but that PL would get in touch with them again.

PR asked whether PL had met with Pyrton ?

JH said they had met but that no ongoing dialogue has been established.

JH asked whether Watlington NP are still interested in an alternative route?

GB said yes it had to be an option but needed to be a proper scheme and up to now this had not been finalised in any detail. Feedback from the roadshows showed support for an alternative route but people wanted to know the number of houses involved. The NP have met with Providence Land and Archstone but their plots are either

end of road and it needed to be joined up. The impact of traffic management in the town also needs to be considered. TP said that more information is needed on Wat 9 and Wat10. TH said detail on Wat9 had not been progressed as the PL team have been waiting on NP progress. He estimated up to 90 houses for this site. WAT10 proposals are in progress.

JH asked whether the number of houses was an issue or do people just want a road?

PR said that people are worried that a new road will bring more traffic.

IH said that Watlington only has 1200 houses currently and most people want to retain the character of the town and not have huge numbers of new houses.

3. AOB

TH asked what will be ready in 2 weeks time in terms of sites?

GB said traffic input will delay any integrated work, this is still waiting on work to look at traffic in the 'region' to include the impacts on neighbouring parishes. This is also delayed because OCC have no transport model for this area.