

**Minutes of the Meeting of the
Houghton Neighbourhood Plan Working Party (NPWP)
with a representatives of Davidsons
held at Houghton Village Hall
20th April 2017 (1435 – 1615)**

01-04/17	<p>Present</p> <p>Ian Hill (Chair), Rosemary Hamilton, Mike Hearn, John Siddons, Huw Francis (Secretary) – all NPWP</p> <p>Ian Pickering and Matthew Sanders (Director and chartered architect respectively) - representing Davidsons</p>
02-04/17	<p>Review of Issues relating to the Davidsons Plan as discussed at Houghton Parish Council Meeting on 13th April 2017</p> <p>IP opened the meeting by thanking the NPWP for inviting him to the meeting and said that he was keen to resolve the points raised at the PC meeting on 13th April 2017. He also commented that their application had now moved from Outline status to Reserve Matters and that the planning determination date had been set at 6th June 2017.</p> <p>The meeting agreed to review, in order, each of the points raised at the PC Meeting.</p> <p><u>General Points</u></p> <p>IH commented that Davidsons’ current plan, which envisaged building a large proportion of four and five bedroom properties, did not meet the housing needs of Houghton as made clear in the draft Neighbourhood Plan. Many residents had expressed a desire to remain in the village whilst at the same time downsizing to smaller properties, such as bungalows. IP explained that it was unprofitable for them to build more bungalows. JS suggested they might look at building properties which might be adaptable to provide downstairs bedrooms. This might for example involve adapting a dining room with a next door bathroom into an en-suite. Residents could then live downstairs while having the upstairs bedrooms for visitors. IH commented that he believed that residents would be prepared to pay a premium for such properties and/or bungalows in the village.</p> <p>Action 1: IP agreed to review how Davidsons might adapt their existing plans for four and five bedroom properties to meet this need.</p> <p>Action 2: IP agreed to review the provision of equipment for the children’s play area to meet the needs of younger children.</p> <p>Action 3: IP agreed to change the plans for the two green areas to include knee rails.</p> <p>Action 4: IP agreed to check that fibre for broadband would be housed in ducting to all properties.</p>

The Village Design Statement's Twelve Principles

- 1) Connections: IP commented that their plan did not envisage two vehicle routes in and out of the plot but they had designed it to allow for connections through to future developments
- 2) Facilities and Service: IP agreed to arrange a joint meeting with NPWP and LCC to discuss crossing and traffic management issues on the A47 - **Action 5**
- 3) Public Transport: MS commented that Davidsons would provide a new bus shelter
- 4) Meeting Local Housing Requirements: see General Points above.
- 5) Character: IP felt that Davidsons had produced a well-designed estate and would be using local building materials, such as Ibstock brick, a variety of local roof tiles and traditional (Monsorrel) render. Whilst commenting that they spend the majority of their money on front of buildings, he agreed to explore further how they might add variety to the buildings by using patterned brick work to break up end and blank walls. He also agreed to look into using different colour slabs for footways and send IH photographs of existing Davidsons houses – **Action 6**
- 6) Working with Site and its content – NFA
- 7) Creating well defined streets and space. NFA
- 8) Easy to find your way around. IP agreed to amend the plan to move the footpath which will link the Davidsons and Hazelton estates to accommodate the building work on the Hazelton site – **Action 7**
- 9) Streets for All - NFA
- 10) Car parking: IP agreed to explore adding a visitor space. As mentioned above at Action 3, General Points, Davidsons will also put a knee high rail by grass space to stop people parking on the grass – **Action 8**
- 11) Public and Private Spaces – NFA
- 12) External Storage and amenity spaces. IP commented that their plans envisaged waste bins being stored in back gardens. Davidsons would also be providing collection points at ends of private drives. IP agreed to check on the provision of secure bike storage for properties with no garages – **Action 9**

Design of Houses as described in Section 1.6.1 of the VDS

1.6.1 (j) Harvesting surface water. IP commented that this was not the responsibility of the developer.

IP concluded his comments by agreeing to research the possibility of providing more open market, shared ownership properties (80% in perpetuity) in lieu of affordable housing – **Action 10.**