

**Emberton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group**  
**(A committee of Emberton Parish Council)**  
**Minutes of Meeting held at The Pavilion**  
**on Tuesday 5<sup>th</sup> July 2022 at 7pm**

**Present:** Jason Bevan - Chairman  
Fred Markland – Vice Chairman  
Melanie Duncan  
Colin Jamieson  
Harry White  
Chris Akrill

Karen Goss – Clerk

1. **Introductions and Apologies for Absence** – Apologies for absence were received from Virginia Tierney.
2. **Declarations of Interest in items on the agenda** – Fred Markland Declared an Interest in item 4 as the applicant of a Call for sites put forward.
3. **To approve the Minutes of the Meeting held on the 31<sup>st</sup> January 2022** – The Minutes of the previous Meeting held on the 31<sup>st</sup> January 2022 were agreed and signed by the Chairman.
4. **Feedback from Article 14 pre-submission consultation** –

**Milton Keynes Council - Policy H3** – the current appeal for 34 Gravel Walk may make this policy moot. However, there is an opportunity to more tightly control development and address the parish’s concerns expressed through the planning application/appeal process, eg scale of building, footpaths, overlooking etc.

#### **LLFA**

##### Land South of Gravel Walk

This section of land is shown at low risk from surface water flooding. There may be unmapped ditches associated with field ditches on the adjacent fields. However, it should be noted that the LLFA are not aware of any formalised public surface water drainage network for this area. The LLFA will object to any foul sewer connections for surface water.

##### Land off Harvey Drive

This section of land is shown as at very low risk from surface water flooding. However, it should be noted that the LLFA are not aware of any formalised public surface water drainage network for this area. The LLFA will object to any foul sewer connections for surface water. It should also be noted that a foul pumping station is close to this site and there may be below ground pipe networks managed by Anglian Water Services; these can be subject to easements or require diverting.

Further information should be sought from Anglian Water Services.

## **Highways**

Policy H3 – Gravel Walk. The policy mentions similar to H2 parking to meet the needs of the development so perhaps refer to the parking standards SPD. It should also be noted that this site is currently the subject of an appeal – 21/01130/FUL.

Policy H4 - in the first paragraph the policy refers to two dwellings. In the paragraph in car parking, it refers to new dwelling suggesting just one? The policy as per above may wish to refer to the MKC parking standards SPD. The Harvey Drive is not the best site. Harvey Drive is narrow, it is some distance from the highway so servicing/refuse collection will not be as easy as other sites. The site serves three dwellings and it looks like some rear access to houses on Olney Road.

**Natural England** – Reviewed policies E1, E2 and E3 and had no further comment.

**Historic England** - Welcomed the production of the neighbourhood plan and were pleased to see that the historic environment of the neighbourhood plan area featured throughout. This active commitment to Heritage Assets is highlighted within your Development policies H1 and H2 including setting. The chapter Character and Design brings additional weight to the subject by referencing the historic environment including significant views in the objectives. We are pleased to support CD1: Conservation and Heritage Paragraph 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires that plans “contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals”. We feel that the policy adheres well to this requirement. We also welcome CD2: High Quality Design in relation to the vision for development within the Conservation Area and the use of high-quality materials which complement the existing palette of local materials.

### **34 Gravel Walk – Response from resident**

The land at Southern end of Gravel Walk denoted as part of H3 proposed Allocation is Agricultural Paddock and NOT a garden as the applicants for the planning have repeatedly implied. It is outside the area of the MK Strategic Development Plan and in breach of DS5 to develop as was identified in previous planning application in 2019. The current property at No 34 adjoining H3 was itself an extension of the existing development boundary and had stipulations applied to it when approved. One of these was that the parking spaces had to be clearly designated and were not to be used for any other purpose. Therefore, could not now be used to enable access to H3 as this would be in breach of the conditions imposed and any alternative access at South end of Gravel Walk would be beyond the boundary identified for H3. Secondly it was identified that the area adjoining the proposed H3 area was a paddock and agricultural and could not be used as a garden. There is a new Appeal being lodged against the declined planning application but this does not change the main point of rejection in that the land is agricultural/paddock NOT garden as the applicants have incorrectly and repeatedly claimed.

**Impact on existing housing** - The current property at 34 Gravel Walk was built as a side on house with all rear facing windows/doors etc placed on the South side directly facing the proposed land at H3. The current occupiers themselves would not lodge any objection as they are the party wishing to develop H3. Planning must

surely consider the impact nevertheless for all future residents of No 34 as it would have a dramatic impact on privacy and light to the South face of No 34 which is the main Glazed aspect of the house. Gravel Walk itself was already an extension of the development plan and has been identified should retain its open visual amenity onto countryside beyond. No 34 was already an extension of the development boundary and one must consider where is the line in the sand if properties continue to be developed onto countryside beyond. The original proposed Emberton Neighbourhood Plan did not include the paddock at Gravel Walk and why should that have changed in the interim leading to this amended submission when it had already been considered in the original planning application. There appears to be other development opportunities already identified which are within the existing development boundary to meet the new housing requirement for Emberton. (West Lane, Olney Road and Nurseries). The impact of developing H3 in Gravel Walk has a disproportionate negative impact (visual Amenity of Gravel Walk and property at No34) for the gain of 1 property. We are also concerned that the inclusion of the conservation area to rear of Gravel Walk properties on East side as within development boundary will lead to this being lost to development in the future. The conservation area of woodland East of Gravel Walk should be placed outside the development boundary to prevent further encroachment onto agricultural land and the loss of well-developed trees forming a natural boundary to the village.

### **Fred Markland left the meeting for the next item**

#### **Harvey Drive**

##### **Responses received from 5 residents, summarised as follows:**

MKC already have a 5-year land supply therefore further housing not required. Emberton Neighbourhood Plan only identified a need for 1 property. No school, shop or bus service. Site is partly within Plan:MK settlement boundary. Loss of privacy and loss of light. Access to Harvey Drive is narrow and not suitable for access by large HGV's. One resident raised the question whether the Steering Group had followed the correct procedure with regard to a parish council putting forward a site allocation.

### **Fred Markland returned to the meeting.**

**Summary** – Jason responded that the committee could be reassured that the site allocations were dealt with in the correct way and that most of the comments regarding the Harvey Drive site could be addressed by a planning application. Chris responded that highways had looked at the Harvey Drive site and the access would be sufficient to serve 5 dwellings. Jason commented that one house was not deemed positive for the plan, with 10 houses originally being looked at. It was noted that once the plan had been submitted to MKC, the ability to change it would be reduced. Some of the plan would need to be amended slightly to take into account the appeal for 34 Gravel Walk. **Action: CA** to speak to David Blandamer. There was a general agreement that the plan needed to be positive despite having a 5-year land supply as a negative plan would weaken the parish council's ability to say no to other sites.

**Land off West Lane – feasibility study** – A feasibility study for development off West Lane had been put forward for 5 properties with parking for the Church. It was noted that the land was outside the development boundary and MKC highways had previously objected to development in this area. It was also noted that the site

had been submitted outside of the timeframe to look at it. The steering group agreed that the site impacted on the historical assets of the village, namely the conservation area and the Church. There was also the question of the public footpath which would run through the site.

5. **Next steps**

6. **Any other business – grant application.** Chris reported that he would look to see if a grant was available. **Action: CA.**

7. **Date of next meeting** – Date to be agreed.

The meeting closed at 7.55pm

DRAFT