

Developers Forum Meeting - 12th March 2015

Attendees: 130 plus (standing room only)

Cllr Gosling (Chairman KPC) opened the Public Meeting by thanking everyone for coming. Each developer would be invited to make a formal presentation followed by questions from the floor. Cllr Gosling went on to thank the 3 developers present for coming together. Those developers with planning applications currently under consideration had declined the offer to attend.

Site 1 – Land off Lighthorne Road, Kineton

Mike Jones & Hannah Watson – Richborough Estates; John & Roger Peel – Land Owners

The 'Early Ideas' for the development were shared along with the Peel family's long association with Kineton. Reference was made to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and their desire to work with the Parish Council to improve local facilities.

Q Mr [REDACTED] asked how they could justify using agricultural land when there were brown field sites and vacant housing within the District

A To meet population growth

Q Mr [REDACTED] asked if the developers would consider building a bypass to ease worsening traffic congestion?

A Would consider working with other developers

Q Mr [REDACTED] raised concern over the proximity of the proposed development to existing housing

Q Mr [REDACTED] stated that new development should be integrated into the village, not designed as a separate community. He went on to propose at the planning stage that there wasn't a vague commitment to the improvement of local facilities but that 5% of build costs be put towards car parking solutions, schools and medical facilities

A Richborough advised that they must work within the rules of planning but would be happy to investigate further with the Local Planning Authority

Q Ms [REDACTED] raised concern about the scale of the potential development and at the rate at which development was taking place

A Richborough to work with Parish Council

Site 2 – Land off Warwick Road, Kineton

Jason Tate (Planning Prospects) on behalf of Gladman

An in depth presentation was given on the proposed scheme. Reference was made to informal discussions with local residents prior to the commencement of the formal meeting and their concerns over traffic and infrastructure which, it was stated, would be taken on board.

Q Mr [REDACTED] stated there were a number of rights to sections of land in the railway cutting

Q Mrs [REDACTED] raised concern over access to the proposed site

Q Mr [REDACTED] also raised concern over access, the speed of traffic on Warwick Road and what traffic calming measures if any would be used?

A Mr Tate advised that a highway consultant had been engaged; highways matters would therefore evolve during the development of the scheme

- Q Ms [REDACTED] praised the developer for incorporating a wildlife corridor into the development but raised great concern over the destruction of yet more natural habitat
- A Mr Tate advised the completed ecology report had found the site to have limited bio diversity
- Q Mr [REDACTED] raised concern over the loss of a heritage asset should the railway bridge be pulled down to facilitate access into the site.

**Site 3 – Land West of Southam Road, Kineton
Rebecca Mitchell, Barwood**

A brief overview of the benefits of the proposed site was given before taking questions from the floor.

- Q Mr [REDACTED] raised concern that none of the developers had mentioned sheltered housing.
- Q Mr [REDACTED] questioned how the proposed development could be integrated into village. In the developer's own presentation she had stated you would drive to the shops so presumably not using the ones in the village. He also questioned the developer's integrity citing their intention to turn the proposed industrial units into housing. What the village needed was starter homes not 5 bedroom houses.
- Q Mr [REDACTED] raised the question of the by pass
- A Depends on land owners, involves a lot of people
- R Needs to go into the Neighbourhood Plan
- Q Mr [REDACTED] asked if the surface water deposited onto lower sections of the site had been calculated
- A Would have to be less than now as green field or planning application would be refused
- Q Mr [REDACTED] questioned how the proposed development would enhance the village. A further 70 houses if built on the opposite side of the road on the entrance to the village would change the look of it forever.
- A Statement accepted by the developer
- Q Mr [REDACTED] stated that the village needed to be clear on what they wanted from development to ensure that S106 monies didn't go to the County Council like last time
- Q Mr [REDACTED] stated none of the proposals had answered villager's questions; if all sites came forward it would swamp the village
- A Willing to work together with community
- Q To Parish Council
- Mr [REDACTED] How many houses do we need?
- A Needs of District set by Stratford District Council; Core Strategy currently under examination; Inspector's interim conclusions are due in next week

In closing the meeting Cllr Gosling thanked everyone for attending. Flyers were distributed to attendees for further comment.