Shiplake Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Committee

Meeting No 18 – 20 06 2018 7.30 pm Morning Room

Draft Minutes

Present: DP,DB,SM,JW,JD,WS, PB **Apologies: EB**

1.	Minutes of last meeting of 16 05 2018 & any arisings Approved	PB/ALL
2.	Update re PC approval of Consultation Draft NP on 11 06 2018 and agreement to go out to consultation viz all sites approved, housing numbers approved, GDB's approved, Green Gap/Spaces Approved. Some push back on evidence base items relative to New Road. A number of minor variations made to draft which subject to updating of Thames Farm statement has been approved in principle to move to Consultation stage. DP drafting wording for approval by PC working group. See also next para re NP boundaries debate. Initial decision to go for current boundaries possible second thoughts. PC have asked SG to further discuss and recommend. A long discussion ensued about the pros and cons of this change for apprx 1.5 hours. A vote was taken and it was agreed by a majority decision of 6:1 that on balance we should recommend that we stand with the current boundary, seek a variation once the plan has been made or other earliest opportunity and notify SODC, Henley and Harpsden Councils that that was Shiplakes intent and therefore no discussions or Agreements should be made re Shiplake Parish land in the proposed new Henley and Harpsden updated plan. DP to advise PC and obtain their Agreement to proceeding in this way	DP DP ALL DP
3.	Is everyone on SG happy with our draft? All parties expressed approval of the draft plan. DB pointed out error in section 6 regarding reference to crossing by Tower House. Reference now deleted, and WS requested removal of a line re Community Space referring to ongoing use of Parking being permitted by Northfield Road Group – now also deleted in plan. DP to remove from newsletter and article on web. Post meeting note: EB also confirmed approval by email subsequently	ALL ALL/EB DP
4.	Results/outputs of Evidence Base Review – Any further comments? PB advised document updated to provide access to all minutes and agendas of all SG meetings. No further points raised	SM/EB/DB PB
5.	SM to brief team on Consultation Draft actions needed and also what then happens post Consultation and any other steps we should be taking. This took place plus a discussion about it not being necessary to print off evidence base documents. 4 hard copies needed for pubs x 2 corner shop and PC Clerk. Local publicity notices required Also agreed to clarify wording of NP to ensure that people were clear that Community Space is only an idea and not formal part of plan	SM SM PB
6.	Methodology and responsibilities for fielding questions/objections/happy folk • Suggest weekly meeting of a sub group • Agree who and how to respond to each item • Make recommendations to SG for changes to Plan	ALL

	• Liaison with PC over changes and feedback It was agreed that a sub group of 4 would review all responses to Consultation stage and agree how each should be responded to all as above. Any proposals to change the document would be passed up to the main SG to review and liaise with PC. Group to comprise SM,JW,DP by phone if away and PB. Group to hold brief weekly review meetings	PB/DP/SM/JW
7.	Consultation Statement/Log (including to PC and not seen by SG) Work in Progress to be ready in c 8 weeks time	SM/DP DP/SM
8.	O/S from last meeting: DP will circulate a note with key themes and anything he believes may need to be part of the NP. He will also do a note to all residents as part of his regular update – Update on progress. DP has reviewed and stated nothing further needed for circulation	DP DP
9.	Update on letters received and discuss any actions to be taken: **Old:** 1. Initial from R Wild obo 12 residents ie 6 properties 8 Nov re New Road – *Ongoing emails received* 2. (Ongoing) from M Denehey and wife 17 Nov re New Road 3. Lord Wrottesley re NP general and sites 39-42 18 Dec 4. James Parsons New Road re New Road 09 Dec 5. Jane Edwards New Rd re new Road 11 Dec 6. John Bocock New Road re New Road 28 Nov 7. Sara Smith New Road re New Road 4 Dec 8. Chris Elliott – Thornfield House, Crowsley Road. Re New Road 04/01/2017 9. Kevin James Lashbrook Grange – Info request only 10. Kate Oldridge New Road re New Road 02/01/2018 11. Chris Penrose General observation re statistics/referendum etc 03/01/2018 12. Further letter from R Wild and also correspondence with PC see below/attached 13. Request from Charles Wright for breakdown of stats at exhibition 14. Joanne Stone (extant objection to New Road) DP to visit and review extent of *Shiplake Honey Business* 15. Cate Avery – Objection to Site 30. No action needed, objection noted 16. Charles Wright re Definition of Brownfield Land. 17. Pete Waller Bask. Lane – Info request. Very happy with info provided 18. Savills obo Phillimore – Letter re maintaining Allocation site 30 etc Respond suggesting 2 and 3 bed only **New:** 19. Askin Family – objecting to site 30. DP has responded 20. Further enquiry Ian Mckean re new GDB and his piece of Land at Mole end DP holding response PB to follow up 21. John Stewart and others re Mole End/Firs Lodge GDB boundary (same as above) DP holding response PB to follow up 22. PC request to remove some of evidence base in draft – Appx 6 – Agreed to re write as part of ConsultationStatement/log,	 PB PB

	Appx 3 table of short listed sites – Rejected request Part Appx 2 – Rejected request, Various minor wording issues and various minor policy variations agreed. Noted by the meeting and wording to agenda to be updated/clarified 23. Robert Tetlow – See attached/below Agreed to delay further meeting with Robert and the commercial users until timing of consultation stage known – say c 3 weeks in principal 24. Further reps to PC made re site 6 designation DP to provide full details	PB SW DP
10.	Outstanding on Report Writing/Content Assembly, CAD and other plans etc - O/S Environment and Sustainability Are WS/JD happy with content? Yes - SEA Scoping Assessment done, consultations underway and report underway final draft now due. A final draft of the SEA from AECOM was circulated to all by email for review/comment. DP also to ask Locality re possible sustainability report re Thames Farm given that SODC were suggesting that we review the issue. - Crossing to A 4155 Proposals added to policies and also to NP draft, amended for PC – No 106 contrib, use CIL instead, ditto Shared Space if it proceeds - O/S Delivery Strategy DP to review asap -Updating Plans, Photos etc ? - Consultation Statement and Log - Timing - Apprx 2 months Anything else? Nothing New raised	WS/JD JW/WS DP/PB ALL DP/PB PB/SM/DP/WS DP WS/PB DP/PB/WS ALL DP/SM
11.	Progress re Meetings with major landowners. Wyevale and Shiplake Motors. Planning Application for B1/B2 and Residential submitted 20 March. PC objecting to residential use of site. Henley likely to support. Any update Rugby pitches – Any Update/sits on land we are designating as valued landscape?? Site 30 – Savills for Phillimore. PB Advised NP will call for 2/3 bed accom only Memorial Hall Sports Ground – Draft of Policy approved by Trustees and also PC	PB JD/PB/DP DP PB PB
12.	Forward Planning/Milestones SEA Report (draft awaited / reasonable alternatives delivered) NP Draft Report to be complete Late June Evidence Base to complete Added in Agendas and Minutes of SG Consultation Report and Log to complete Target Date? Proof Read / Final check of links page numbers etc? Late June Final Review Pre- handing over to PC for approval 3/4 June PC to approve 11 June Submit / upload for Consultation now onwards	All

13.	Timings and Project Plan update. JW to Update per above when understood better	JW
14.	AOB/Next Meeting- 20 June 2018 unless not necessary Next series of meetings – dates circulated up till September. DP to check room availability with college A discussion took place about the issue of sustainability and how the SG/NP can demonstrate that no further development was sustainable in Lower Shiplake as advised by SODC. DP to discuss with Locality SM to review other options eg lack of utilities/age and capacity of infrastructure	ALL DP DP SM

Bob Tetlow Architect
York Cottage Northfield Road Lower Shiplake
Henley on Thames RG9 3PA
07902929873

14 June 2018

Lower Shiplake, Village Centre Improvements

From Bob Tetlow, York Cottage, Northfield Road.

I write to offer feedback on the proposed road improvements outside the Corner shop, following the release of a preliminary design at the pop-up meeting on Saturday 2 June.

I live in Northfield Road and I am Chair of the Northfield Road Fund. As you are aware Northfield Road is a private road. It is a not adopted, has no street lighting or surface water drainage. The maintenance of the road is undertaken by the residents and businesses on Northfield Road. This feedback is not on behalf of the residents of Northfield Road, the comments and opinions expressed are my own.

Northfield Road has for many years been used as a free car park for the customers of the butchers shop, the corner shop and The Baskerville Arms as well as acting as an overflow car park for the station. In effect the residents of Northfield Road provide and maintain, at their own expense, a village car park for six vehicles along the fence side and three vehicles against the post office garden wall. However, we have found in recent years the access to Northfield Road has become blocked by parked vehicles on several occasions, and there has been an increase in traffic using the driveways of the residents in Northfield Road for turning,

Comments.

1. **Vehicle Parking**. The published plan gives no indication of parking for vehicles except for the goods delivery vehicle position. I assume the designer had no brief to examine this problem, or the assumption is that parking will take place in a random manner and, as was mentioned at the parish council presentation, that if parking on the public highway was limited then people could park in Northfield Road. Obviously, this is unacceptable as Northfield Road is private land. I would ask that the designer shows where vehicles will park at peak times. If this design is implemented without consideration of the parking issues, and Northfield Road becomes congested with parking then there will be no alternative but to install posts on
both sides of Northfield Road from Station Road to the first houses. This would leave one parking spaces outside the butcher's shop and possibly two spaces adjacent to the corner shop garage. The parking displaced from Northfield Road would then have to be accommodated elsewhere. I cannot see where the displaced parking can be

accommodated, and the design should address this issue. Sadly, there is no indication or provision for disabled parking, which is essential.

2. **Provision for increased parking in the future**. No consideration has been given to the increased demand for parking once the Thames Farm development is completed. After all these residents will consider themselves part of the village and will wish to use the corner shop, the butcher and Baskerville Arms. Further strain on the parking will come with the development of the 'Wyevale site'.

3. **The three businesses need to be consulted in detail**. The centre of Lower Shiplake is the Corner shop, the Butchers shop and The Baskerville Arms. The availability of parking is vital to the continued success of these businesses. Alterations to the road and parking layout without detailed plans which demonstrate how parking would be achieved will be a disaster for these businesses.

4. What are the benefits of this investment? The documentation handed out at the pop-up meeting on 2 June 2018 listed the key elements of the design. These key elements do not necessarily bring a benefit to the village centre. I list some comments below:

	Key Element	**Comment**
	'A kink in the road will reduce drivers speed'.	There is a 20 mph speed limit on Station Road, not always observed. At busy times the traffic speeds at the junction are low due to the reduced sight lines and visibility. I am not aware of any serious accidents at this junction in the last 10 years with the present arrangement.
	'each approach road will consist of concentric circles, giving the impression of roundabout priorities'.	This is part of the surface road design which will bring little benefit to the village.
	'extensions to the pedestrian areas at each corner can be released. Seating and planting will dissuade parking on the pedestrian areas.'	The extension of these areas will displace the vehicle parking currently in these positions. Where will these cars park? Two areas of seating are shown. Both appear to be in high risk positions, as they are being used to dissuade parking. The bench on Mill Lane appears to have been removed.
	'the school bus pick-up and drop-off can take place in a much safer place'.	The designer should demonstrate how the school drop off will become safer. At a minimum a plan should be drawn up to show the bus/coach turning circle and if this can be achieved if there are vehicles parked within the 'roundabout' area. Has anyone looked at alternative drop off

		points for the school bus that would reduce risk to the children and parents?
	'the area outside the shop will allow for wider access'.	The path up to the corner shop door seems sufficient at present. It would be a shame to lose the garden and lawn which the corner shop allows residents and visitors to use. Bounded by a low wall it provides a protected environment from the traffic.
	'an extended reserved area for delivery vehicles '	As this space is reserved it will further restrict car parking. What will prevent casual parking by non-delivery vehicles?
	'Possible site for cycle rack'	A cycle rack would be a useful addition.

It would be correct to publish the actual benefits to the village, over and above what is already provided and what the project would bring to the village. I see no benefit over and above current arrangements which allow parents to collect children from the school bus and customers from the village to park outside the shops. The Corner Shop garden allows casual social interaction and the bench at Mill Lane together with the picnic table in the Corner shop give somewhere for visitors to sit and rest.

5. Have other solutions been investigated?

Perhaps more low-key improvements should be considered. The road at the junction could be resurfaced in a colour. The designer could look at a different road surfaces where the original footpath outside the corner shop was extended which is now used for on 'footpath' parking. Permission could be sought to provide an extra picnic table and/or bench for the corner shop garden, extra benching could be provided box at the junction of Mill Lane and Station Road.

Has anyone investigated the purchase of the station car park from Network Rail. Network Rail receive no income from this land. If this car park became part of the village then it could be used for village parking with say a maximum stay of 4 hours. This would allow people visiting the village to visit the shops, it would allow the provision of disabled parking bays. It may then be possible to persuade Aviva bus services to bring the service to the station, for commuters. If a bus stop is provided at the station car park it would eliminate the need to cross Reading Road when returning from Reading by bus. On dark winter days and evenings, it is hard to cross Reading Road to reach the village safety.

6. **How much will the work cost?**
   An initial cost plan should be published, giving a breakdown of works to utilities (street lighting, drainage etc.), works to the highway, street furniture and planting, works to the garden of the corner shop, and consultant's fees. The estimated cost of £130,000 given in the document appears to be very low.

7. **Conclusion**
   The document issued with the design states 'once the outline design concepts have received approval, a detailed design will take place.' The brief to the designers should be published to ensure that the requirements of this project have been met. I believe there are fundamental issues which must be resolved before this design is submitted for approval. It should be made clear on what basis and by whom this design will be approved. This work is not part of the Neighbourhood plan. Most people, when asked, 'Would you like to see a village centre' would say yes. That 'approval' is not 'carte blanche' to proceed with a design will not deliver a working public area at the junction of Station Road and Mill Lane. The opinions of those residents and businesses directly affected by the changes should have more weighting. Their comments, opinions and ideas should be sought in detail, and their concerns should be answered. The location of the three businesses at the road junction make the village centre, somewhere most residents go. Any money spent should enhance the environment and bring additional benefits to the businesses and the community.

.

York Cottage Northfield Road Lower Shiplake Henley on Thames RG9 3PA
www.bobtetlowarchitect.co.uk