

MINUTES OF THE EXTRA-ORDINARY MEETING OF TRING TOWN COUNCIL
HELD IN THE VICTORIA HALL, AKEMAN STREET, TRING
ON MONDAY 17TH MAY 2018 AT 7.30 P.M.

Present: Councillors: G. Wilkins (Chairman)
J. Bowden
Mrs O. Conway
Mrs P. Hearn
S. Hearn
M. Hicks
P. Hills
N. Hollinghurst
N. Nutkins

Also Present: Mr M. Curry, Town Clerk
Mrs D. Slade, Deputy Town Clerk
Mr M. Dawber, Savills
Ms V. Roe, Cala Homes
Mr R. Morris, Cala Homes
117 Members of the Public

19215. TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Cllr Mrs Ransley (prior engagement), Cllr Townsend and Cllr Grace (both family circumstances)

RESOLVED: To accept the apologies for the reasons given

19216. TO MAKE DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

19217. TO RECEIVE A BRIEFING ON 4/00958/18/MFA HYBRID PLANNING APPLICATION LA5, LAND AT ICKNIELD WAY, TRING

The Clerk gave a presentation on the background to the application and what the application covered:

- The development of the Local Allocation through the Core Strategy, Site Allocation and Master Plan to the planning application
- The Town Council's position with regard to the Local Allocation – supportive but with the caveats that the development be:
 - Sympathetic to its prime location as a gateway to Tring.
 - Accompanied by the necessary infrastructure
- The features of the application:
 - 240 Dwellings
 - Cemetery Car Park & Toilet Block
 - Public Open Space
 - 0.75 Hectare Employment Space (B1a,b & c)
 - 1.75 Hectare Cemetery Extension
- The Master Plan development principles:

- Homes
- Employment Area Extension
- Cemetery Extension
- Utilities and Services
- Green Space
- Design
- Highways and Access Landscape
- Green Belt boundary and the Countryside

19218. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Standing orders were suspended by **resolution** to allow members of the public present at the meeting to speak.

The following summarises the points made by members of the public:

- Affordable Housing (details of the numbers and type of affordable houses included in the scheme were available at the meeting):
 - What was the definition of the categories of ‘affordable’ houses included in the scheme?
 - How was the composition and type of affordable houses determined?
 - Could that mix be changed? A request for more shared ownership for young professionals was made
 - It was felt that the affordable housing could have been dispersed more throughout the site
 - If the overall numbers of the site was reduced would the number of affordable house be reduced?

The Clerk explained the difference between social rented housing and intermediate housing. Cala outlined the way in which the affordable houses would be delivered through a partnership with a Housing Association. The number of affordable houses met the 40% criterion set by Dacorum Borough Council (DBC). Similarly the split between the categories of affordable housing was made on direction from DBC as the most appropriate. This was not necessarily set in stone if there was evidence to the contrary. If the total number of houses were to be reduced, the 40% being affordable houses would be maintained.

- Housing Location & Density
 - Comment was made that the houses proposed were too large and there should be greater emphasis on properties for down-sizing, releasing larger houses for families within the town
 - There was objection to the relatively higher density of housing on the eastern side of the housing development

The Cala representative pointed to the Home Development Principle in the LA5 Master Plan that states ‘Provide a mix of house types, including family homes and larger, more spacious properties’. Reducing the housing density east to west gave the ‘softer edge to the countryside’ as required

- Traffic & Transport
 - Concern was expressed:
 - that the lack of a through route from the north of the site to the south would just move a rat-run from the site to Miswell Lane
 - about the volume of traffic that the development would generate within the town
 - How many car parking spaces were going to be provided?
 - Sustainable transport
 - Lack of car parking at Tring Station
 - No cycleway to Tring School or the Station
 - Bus services were considered inadequate except from the High Street. A service into the town should be provided
 - A question of ownership on Donkey Lane to allow the proposed cycleway

Savills explained that the layout was designed to comply with Hertfordshire County Council's demands. A traffic assessment had been undertaken. 617 car parking spaces would be provided and garages would be built to cater for the size of the latest cars.

He continued with the fact that there was no requirement from DBC for onsite infrastructure. Infrastructure provision such as a cycleway would come through the Community Infrastructure Levy (approximately £3million) payable to DBC and possibly bespoke contributions through legally binding Section 106 agreements (Under Regulation 123 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 DBC publishes a list of infrastructure projects that may benefit from CIL funding. The list is reviewed annually. It is available on the DBC website).

With regard to the Open Space a guarantee would be given that this would remain open space in perpetuity and provision made for its management.

The point on ownership of Donkey Lane was noted.

Councillor Hollinghurst, in his role as local County Councillor, explained that there was continued discussion of bus routes, cycleways, etc. He quoted a cost of £2,000 per week to subsidise the 387 bus.

Hertfordshire County Council is a consultee to the planning application and will respond to the details included in the application.

In response to a question about vehicular access to Okeley Lane from the central corridor dividing the site, the Cala representative confirmed this was purely for pedestrians and cyclists. This could be reinforced by the use of bollards. The division between the north and south sites was a green corridor.

- Cemetery Extension
 - The cemetery car parking could be used by residents because of insufficient parking provision

- There was insufficient delineation between the cemetery car park and the flats
- Why was the extension separate from the existing site?
Comment was made that given the development no longer included the gypsy and traveller site, the need for a separate extension of the cemetery had been lessened

The Cala representatives noted the first two points above.

The separate cemetery extension was specified by the DBC Cemeteries Manager. It provided a better setting for the natural burial ground and was better suited than land adjacent to the existing cemetery. The proposed location of the natural burial ground softened the impact on the A.O.N.B.

- Infrastructure Provision
 - There was no spare capacity in the Town's primary schools and there were no plans for the secondary school to expand
 - Would the CIL funds and possible Section 106 agreements be used for the benefit of Tring and how would they be used?
 - The lack of infrastructure provision at the Castlemead development in Pitstone was cited

The Clerk reported that the Officers from Hertfordshire's School Planning Section gave a presentation to members of the Town Council on how they monitor and assess the provision of school places [Post meeting note: During consideration of the Site Allocations Pre-Submission Consultation 2014, their estimate showed the capacity within the primary schools to meet the forecast growth in pupil numbers. With regard to secondary places, it was their consideration that there was expansion potential at the school, should it be required, to meet local need, but that a detached playing field may be required. DBC included such a provision in the Site Allocations].

Councillor Hollinghurst, in his role as local County Councillor, outlined how the County Council can only make school places available if a planning application is in draft or an actual plan is being considered. However, outline plans to meet possible growth have been prepared – a new secondary school (in Tring or between Tring and Berkhamsted); 1½ class entry at primary school with the fall-back position of a new primary school.

He explained how, whilst the County Council had responsibility to provide school places, the schools were no longer under their control. New builds would be County Council funded – this could influence where they were sited.

Councillor Hollinghurst drew attention to the fact that DBC as the Planning Authority was the key player in how housing need should be met. This application was at the end of the initial planning period – the new Single Local Plan was approaching with the possible prospect of 1,000 additional houses.

He continued on how the discussion of LA5 was started with a three day conference locally. Consultees included Hertfordshire County Council, the

water companies and the other utilities (The NHS did not participate). This was how the requirements of LA5 were developed.

Cllr Mrs Hearn emphasized that DBC were responding to demands placed upon them by Central Government.

- Employment
 - Clarity was sought on the type of businesses that would be on the proposed employment site
- The Impact on Okeley Lane
 - A lack of detail on the proposed fencing between the new development and Okeley Lane
 - The proximity of the proposed houses and flats to existing properties
 - The inclusion of 2½ storey houses and flats dominating and overlooking Okeley Lane
 - The concentration of affordable homes behind Okeley Lane relative to other areas of the site
 - A request was made that building commence on the eastern side to provide screening from the balance of the construction

Cala stated that they were happy to meet and discuss the boundary treatment with residents. The fence would be on the site boundary, providing security for the new dwellings.

The 2½ storey houses were normal houses with dormers in the roof. The back-to-back distance (from wall to wall) between the Okeley Lane houses and the proposed dwellings exceeded the generally accepted 21m separation.

The Cala representative explained that the conditions on approval would specify details such as where construction should start.

- Other Matters
 - The timescale of the development assuming permission is granted by the end of the year
 - Lack of notification by Dacorum Borough Council about the application and the short period in which to respond
 - The lack of a Dacorum representative at the meeting

Dacorum Borough Council fulfilled their statutory obligation with regard to notification of the planning application through four notices, 180 letters and a press notice.

On an assumption of planning permission being granted in December, the Cala representative estimated 2-3months to complete the necessary paperwork before work on the site started in spring. The development was estimated to take approximately 3½ years.

Standing Orders were resumed by **resolution** at 9:12pm

19219. TO CONSIDER THE PLANNING APPLICATION 4/00958/18/MFAS

Having heard the comments from the members of the public each member of the Council gave their view of the planning application. The following points were made:

- The provision of the necessary infrastructure had always been a concern of the Council. It should be part of the planning process
- The location of the cemetery extension should be reconsidered because of the removal of the gypsy and traveller site
- Detail on the management of the cemetery car park should be provided and the area more strongly delineated
- Improving sustainable transport alternatives to cars such as a better bus service and cycleways should be provided through CIL funding or Section 106 agreements
- The type of housing proposed behind Okeley Lane should be reconsidered to reduce the impact e.g. remove the 2½ storey houses

RESOLVED: To recommend refusal of planning application
4/00958/18/MFA

The meeting was closed at 9.39 pm

Chairman