

ICKFORD PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF ICKFORD PARISH COUNCIL

Held on 24th November 2015, at 7.30pm at Ickford Village Hall Annexe

Present: Councillor Ruth Baker (RB) Chair
 Councillor Barbara Kolbert (BK) Clerk
 Councillor Louise Arnold (LA)
 Councillor Peter Jordain (PJ)
 Councillor Vina Parmar (VP)
 County Councillor Michael Rand (MR)

Plus 29 local residents

Item	Previous Minute	Subject	Action
92.		<p>Apologies for Absence Apologies were received from Councillor Andrew Brunet & Nicola Dawson, Parish Clerk.</p> <p>It was agreed that RB would Chair the meeting and BK would take the role of Clerk for the purposes of this meeting. Following the meeting, the clerk (Nicola Dawson) drafted the minutes in the standard format in consultation with BK.</p>	
93.		<p>Declaration of Interest RB declared interest in the VALP plans for Ickford due to her ongoing planning application for future development in the area.</p>	
94.		<p>Requests for Dispensations None received.</p>	
95.		<p>To discuss the implications and options of the AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan</p> <p>RB presented a summary from the recent VALP meeting which she attended, summarising the key issues and options available as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing for those who had no way of being able to buy, i.e. housing association housing and homes for the elderly (those over 60) were identified as being in need of housing. • Questions were asked about why there was not more provision of this kind of housing and it was concluded that this was mainly due to lack of profit for the developers. <p>RB then summarised the options open to Aylesbury Vale to provide enough accommodation for the predicted rise in population in the next 20 years as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To create new settlements, possibly around existing settlements, that had the necessary facilities • Extend Milton Keynes or Aylesbury (which is already full) • Increase the housing density to 15 dwellings per acre • Find more sites • Any combination of the above <p>RB explained other factors that AVDC will take into account when drawing up their plans;</p>	

ICKFORD PARISH COUNCIL

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compulsory purchase would not be an option • Travellers would have to establish a history and proposal to continue to travel to be eligible for traveller sites which developers could be asked to provide within any other development. • Villages could dispute their classification • 100 dwellings allocation is a generalisation. • AVDC would like to prevent one settlement merging into the next. • AVDC are still accepting sites for consideration • Local landscape designations can be challenged by Parish councils. <p>AVDC is due to make a presentation in early January & following this there will be 2 further consultation opportunities.</p>	
<p>96.</p>		<p>Open Forum for Parishioners (under adjournment) RB welcomed local residents to the meeting & invited them to raise any issues, relating to the agenda, to the Parish Council.</p> <p>The general view of the local residents was one of concern about how the VALP would affect Ickford.</p> <p>There were 2 main areas of concern;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) That we should aim to be reclassified from a large village to a small village. Should we be classed as a large village then potentially our housing stock would increase by around 30%. Although there might be benefits if we had large scale development there was no guarantee that this would happen. 2) The perennial issue of the flooding and sewerage in the area and how that would be affected by any new housing. There was concern raised about Ickford turning into a "retirement village" with the majority of young people commuting outside the village as they could not afford to buy within the village. <p>MR explained that Aylesbury Vale need 30% more houses than they have currently and various studies have calculated the future needs of the area. This is a long term plan which is necessary to provide for the predicted growth in the area.</p> <p>The public session was then closed & residents were advised that they could complete their own feedback forms online.</p> <p>The chairman closed the open forum for parishioners.</p>	
<p>97.</p>		<p>To discuss & agree a response to the AVDC reference the VALP</p> <p>Please note the following include suggested responses to be included in the VALP comments form, (yet to be submitted) in line with the decisions taken.</p> <p><i>Question 7 (reference development sites). Do you agree with the conclusions of the HELAA and if not what should it say instead and why?</i></p> <p>Reply: Yes, with regard to Ickford. Unable to comment regarding any other Parishes. The Ickford Parish Council resolved on a majority to agree with the report regarding the 4 specific sites previously proposed and rejected.</p>	

ICKFORD PARISH COUNCIL

		<p>The Ickford Parish Council would consider alternative sites subject to criteria discussed and agreed at a public meeting. This includes, severe and ongoing local flooding issues and sewerage capacity not meeting the current needs of the village.</p> <p><i>Question 8: Is the settlement hierarchy correct and if not why not?</i> Reply: We wish to contest the settlement hierarchy. We appear to have been re-categorised from a smaller to a larger village based purely on 1 set of criteria - number of amenities.</p> <p>We are not within 4 miles of a town and we have very limited employment, so although we have some amenities today, (shop/PO, primary school, pub) we certainly do not meet all sets of the criteria.</p> <p>Our facilities and services have not increased since we were a small village. It seems that the formula has changed to tip the balance. The first criteria that we would fail is the village size - at 680 residents we would be smaller than the large village category.</p> <p>The 5th criteria was a qualitative assessment which we felt was wrongly assessed as only 1 of the previous 4 criteria would classify Ickford as a large village.</p> <p><i>Question 9: Ranking of preferences for options A to I.</i> We do not feel we are in a position to comment on the above as we are unsure of the consequences of any decision we might make.</p>	
--	--	--	--

The meeting closed at 10.02pm

Signed:

Date: