

GREAT AYCLIFFE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN



Notes of a meeting of the Great Aycliffe Neighbourhood Plan Housing Thematic Group, held on Thursday 4 June 2015.

Present: Cllr Mr A M Chandran
 Mr C R Peacock
 Mr J Snowball
 Mrs S Cook
 Mrs E French
 Cllr Mrs W P Hillary
 Mr Craig Farlow

Officers: Miss A Corner – Neighbourhood Plan Engagement Officer
 Mrs C Walton – Corporate & Policy Officer

Item No	Discussion	Action
1.	Apologies for Absence Mr S Howarth, Miss A Donald, Cllr Mr M Dixon	
2.	Introduction Angela thanked everyone for attending and introductions were made as there were some new members to the group. Angela noted that there were a lot of things to get through during the meeting and asked everyone to keep on topic. A back to basics overview was given taking everyone through the process to date:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How we set the vision and objectives • How everything needs to be in general conformity with the NPPF, Local Plan and SBC Saved Policies. 	
3.	Neighbourhood Plan Update <i>Objective 3 – RETAIL</i> , this is not in general conformity with the County Durham Plan therefore we need to obtain as much evidence as possible before any further work can be undertaken. A soft market test has been commissioned by an independent company and until the findings of the market testing is know no further work can progress on this objective. <i>Objective 6 – TRANSPORT</i> , work is on-going with DCC. We have shared all of our consultation evidence with them and are attending meetings to progress this. It is likely that all issues will be dealt with by DCC therefore there may be no further work needed on this. <i>Objective 5 – SUSTAINABILITY & CLIMATE CHANGE</i> , one of the aims was to make land provision for allotments.	



	<p>This is dealt with as part of the Town Council work and will only need a covering paragraph of findings in the issues and options consultation. We are currently working with a number of companies regarding renewable energy and work is progressing on this. The option of a solar farm site was discussed which could help buffer Aycliffe Village from urban sprawl was discussed. However, it was agreed that a general policy with specifics would be more suitable than allocating a site, as it is likely that more approaches will be made for renewable energy.</p> <p><i>Objective 1 – ENVIRONMENT</i>, large green areas are being mapped and ranked to provide information for the consultation. The options so far have been to ‘protect all the greens’; ‘utilise some of greens for parking’; ‘use grass verges for parking’. More details will be provided at a joint meeting on 2nd July 2015 where all groups and the steering group will get together to share information. Parking had been discussed at the last meeting and it was agreed that this be passed to the housing group to progress for new developments. Existing problems will be tackled by the environment group.</p> <p><i>Objective 4 – AYCLIFFE VILLAGE</i>, currently looking at ways to protect the village from sprawl. A green wedge policy would probably be the most suitable. We can define what a green wedge is and what we want it to do. Normally used to define an area not to be developed and to keep the character of something ie. Aycliffe Village. Much easier than to try and define a settlement boundary.</p> <p>The second A3 sheet provided additional detail on the objectives but there is still work to do.</p> <p>The character assessment which will be undertaken will provide a focus to take a number of items forward and will lead most of the policies.</p>	
<p>4.</p>	<p>Housing Issues Objective 2 – Housing a wide range of matters were discussed. However, there were some specific questions raised by the group. <i>The demand for the private market is bungalows less than 120K as people generally want to downsize to release equity.</i> 1. Can we determine price of bungalows in planning? i.e. 120k and under No, this would prove extremely difficult to achieve</p>	<p>Issue Question Planners</p>



	<p>through a planning policy</p> <p><i>To ensure residents have room for storage or guests.</i></p> <p>2. Can we encourage 2 bedroom bungalows? Yes, although this will require a larger footprint and potentially test the viability of the development. Considerations should be given to a variety of older persons accommodation e.g. apartments</p> <p><i>Bungalows and older person's accommodation are the priority for residents however developers are reluctant to build due to the foot print. How can we make this a viable option for developers?</i></p> <p>3. Can we encourage smaller or communal gardens to make bungalows more viable? Yes, this would be a good option for developers however the preference would be for smaller gardens as there may be an issues with the maintenance of a communal garden.</p> <p><i>Residents have said they would like older persons accommodation close to services and facilities.</i></p> <p>4. Can we be site specific for older persons accommodation – sheltered bungalows e.g. Elmfield site and Woodham School – both owned by DCC No, however we could stipulate the following: On sites within ?? miles/metres (TBA) from services we would prefer an enhanced % of bungalows or older persons accommodation as an offset to the affordable homes provision.</p> <p><i>Residents have identified a number of brownfield land sites for housing.</i></p> <p>5. Can we allocate brownfield land for housing which cannot be accommodated for on unviable sites? This is not required. This policy is covered in the NPPF which encourages the redevelopment of brownfield land.</p> <p><i>We are seeing applications for new developments which are high density.</i></p> <p>6. Can we have a say in density? Density is covered within national policies however given the historic significance of Lord Beveridge's vision potentially we could ask for less density. This may</p>	Response



	<p>occur naturally when setting the ratio for green open space.</p> <p><i>High rise apartments are unsightly</i></p> <p>7. Can we avoid high rise? <i>No, however these types of developments are rare today.</i></p> <p><i>Currently parking is a real issue all over the Town, how can we avoid this in future developments?</i></p> <p>8. Can we have a say in garage size to accommodate a car and storage? <i>Yes, we could specify a minimum size but have the option of a drive in the curtilage or car port if the viability is tested. We should also consider safe cycle storage e.g. shed.</i></p> <p>9. Can we set parking allocation higher than CPD <i>No these are covered nationally.</i></p> <p>10. Can we influence that local construction work is offered to local people? <i>Yes, we can suggest local labour agreements within our plan.</i></p> <p>Angela then summarise the discussion Q 1 – no further work to be undertaken Q 2,3,4 – close to the town centre, enhanced provision for bungalows, further work on smaller or community gardens to do Q5 – covered under the NPPF but can link to green spaces/history Q 8 – can add detail regarding minimum sizes for garage, adequate off street parking and adequate safe and secure storage for bikes, more work needs to be undertaken on this.</p>	
5.	<p>Date of Next Meeting The next meeting would be held on Monday 15th June 2015 at the Council Offices.</p>	All to Note