

## **Little Chalfont Park Liaison Group**

**01.10.24**

### **Summary of discussions**

This document is a public record of the key topics raised at the meeting and is separate from the full set of minutes and action points, which is confidential. The project team will update the website Q&As and information regularly based on feedback from these meetings.

For more information on any item mentioned, please first visit the website or contact a member of the Liaison Group.

### **Attendees**

- Sian Lloyd - Little Chalfont Community Association (SL)
- Fiona Williams - Little Chalfont Community Association (FW)
- Chris Holmes - Little Chalfont Parish Council (CH)
- Victor Davies - Little Chalfont Parish Council (VD)
- Henry James – Hill (HJ)
- Isabel Yeardley – Hill (IY)
- Charles Campion – JTP (CC)
- Imogen Spencer-Dale – Cratus Group (ISD)

### **Education provision**

CH asked for an update on the school provision being on or off-site. HJ said Buckinghamshire Education will be consulting on this before the end of the year, but that Hill is not sure if this is an internal or external consultation.

### **Design Code**

The updated version of the design code has been submitted and is currently being validated by Buckinghamshire Council.

CH asked what the main changes were in the revised code. HJ explained Hill spent a full day session with the Design Officer to run through comments, and will share a list of changes.

CH said the LCPLG may comment officially on the new design code, depending on the changes.

### **Planning process**

The team is hoping to submit four different Reserved Matters Applications in the Autumn: the Western Parcel, the pedestrian bridge, the Infrastructure and the Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG).

HJ explained that the statutory determination period for a Reserved Matters Application is 13 weeks, however in his experience, this often takes longer. The delays are often due to ongoing council officer



and external stakeholder consultation.

CH noted the group now have a weekly check of the planning portal but asked to receive updates when any documents are submitted, not just the main applications.

### **Future consultations**

CH asked if there would be separate consultations for the Northern and Eastern parcels. HJ said as they are connected, the Northern and Eastern parcel will likely be submitted as one Reserved Matters Application, for which there will be one public consultation in early 2025.

CH noted that this consultation would need to explain why it did not cover elements such as school and care home.

CH asked if the condition submissions, such as the construction management plan will be put forward for consultation. HJ explained that the council do not typically consult the public on conditions, however the team is happy to share them and receive feedback informally.

CH asked if there could be two weeks for feedback to be received next time, the group agreed.

### **Timescales**

HJ explained that the Reserved Matters Applications for Infrastructure and the SANG would ideally be approved by February 2025 so works can start in April 2025. HJ noted that the SANG needs to be completed by the first occupation.

Hill hopes to start building housing in the Western parcel in Summer 2025, but this would require planning approval in March / April 2025 to enable time for all pre-commencement conditions to be discharged and complete all detailed design work.

CH asked for an indicative timeline of processes, outlining when consultation will be, and when comments will be possible or when an item will just be for information. He noted people are concerned they will miss their chance to comment on items. This would be published on the LCPLG website.

### **Phasing**

CH mentioned concerns that Hill would leave the site after just building the Western parcel. HJ said that financially and reputationally, this would be of no benefit to Hill. Occasionally housebuilders may sell part (or parts) of their site to another developer, however this is not the Hill model, and is more typical with master developers who sell off parcels of a masterplan (e.g. a 3,000-home masterplan) to various other developers.

CH noted that 11% of the Western parcel is Affordable, with a higher proportion to be delivered in the

Northern and Eastern parcels. HJ said while the Western parcel and Northern / Eastern parcel will be separate applications, the building timescales mean that there will be some cross-over between the delivery of the different parcels. He added that the Section 106 Agreement has Affordable Housing triggers, where a certain number of Affordable homes must be built before a certain number of Private homes can be built.

### **S278 works**

All plans will be shared with the LCPLG once ready.

### **Retirement homes and Care Home**

HJ explained that these parcels will be sold to specialist providers. They will then manage their own design, planning applications and consultations.

Hill is in discussions with interested parties, but there is no timescale for a decision. Hill ensured there is commercial interest before purchasing the site.

The Reserved Matters Application for the two parcels will have to be submitted by March 2026, therefore the legal process must take place in 2025.

### **Outline permission**

CH asked what assurances there are, or what action can the LCPLG take, to make sure that the education / care home / retirement housing does not become more housing, noting the new housing targets for Buckinghamshire Council.

HJ said that this land use (education) is confirmed in the outline planning permission, and any departure would have to go through the full planning process. He noted that the appeal decision was based on these elements being included in the scheme.

HJ said any change to the use of the land would be discussed with this group, with the community, and with the Council.

### **Community Facilities**

The community building would be built by Hill and will be in the Northern / Eastern parcel.

There is up to 1,000 sqm for community and commercial space, and it is estimated that around 100 sqm will be delivered as community space.

CH said there are concerns that 380 homes aren't enough to keep retail open. HJ noted the retirement village will help with this, as residents will want to use hyper-local spaces. CH asked how unit use is decided. HJ said they use commercial experts to check with the market and make suggestions.

CH asked if the commercial experts would meet with the community? HJ said yes, although the market interest must play a large part.

### **Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and health services**

HJ noted that Hill will be paying CIL, which goes towards funding infrastructure such as schools and health services. The Council are responsible for then allocating these funds.

CH noted he is talking to Cllr Matthews about the CIL money allocation.

### **The Link**

The group discussed the pathway between the two sides not being accessible to cars.

FW explained that some residents are worried about the clear distinction between the two sides of the development, and worried that the traffic will be too focused on one entrance/exit as more homes are in the Northern and Eastern parcels. However, if The Link did become a vehicular route, it could become a 'rat run'. The group noted that from an ecological perspective, a carriageway providing vehicular access through 'The Link' is impractical and would have a negative impact on wildlife and habitats.

### **September consultation and feedback**

HJ said the recent event felt more like people understood the scheme, 185 people attended.

The Hill team reviewed the process for feeding back to the community, and suggested a full update of the Q&As, then individual responses to residents who asked specific questions, followed by a general update to everyone signposting them to the new Q&A. This email will offer further explanations if anything is not covered in the document. HJ noted Hill will also meet with neighbouring residents if needed.

CH flagged that residents of Loudhams Wood Lane are concerned about heights and levels of the new homes. HJ said they will provide a visualisation showing the height relationship between the proposed properties in the Western parcel and those on Loudhams Wood Lane.

### **Estates Management**

CH said people are concerned about the service fees, and other local sites have had very high fees e.g. Newlands Park. The concerns include that once Hill leaves the site it could increase further. CC noted at this point the residents would oversee choosing the company.

CH asked if the school/care home/retirement/shops also contribute to management fees? HJ said they would.

SL asked if the SANG and site have different contracts/charges? HJ said it is likely to be combined and explained the different fees for flats vs houses – everyone pays for the wider site management, but flats then pay for block maintenance and ground rent on top.

HJ added that Hill will scrutinise the costs proposed and can put more money forward themselves if needed. High fees would put people off buying houses.

HJ hoped that existing residents will benefit from the new open spaces, so knowing there is a maintenance charge/company will assure them it will be maintained.

HJ agreed to provide more details on the type of estate management contract that is being proposed for the site.

### **Roads Network Group**

SL said they have had two face to face meetings with the Group and the two teams have regular discussions.

### **Ecology**

SL noted that the response to the group's ecological questions did not acknowledge the previous inadequate surveys or mention ways in which the ecology team were working to improve from the current position. HJ said that they can provide more information and will facilitate a meeting with the ecologist to promote greater understanding of the HG Biodiversity work on the site.

### **Archaeology**

The trenching work is completed, a report will be produced including next steps, which will be agreed with the council officer and more investigatory work will take place early next year. A Roman element was found in the eastern field.

### **Websites and communications**

The group discussed ways to improve the information on the website covering the transport improvements, and the Hill team agreed to make it clearer.

The LCPLG said they have a newsletter being sent in November which Hill could include an update in.

### **Strategic Landscape Plan**

FW mentioned the footpath is still shown on the northern boundary of the western parcel. HJ explained that the Council has requested that this plan mirrors the original consented parameter plans, however this can then be updated once the new proposals are approved. This change will be shown in the Western parcel application.

### **Next meeting**

The group agreed meetings for the next few months.

The agendas for these meetings will now be uploaded to the LCPLG website, so need to be agreed a week in advance. The group agreed to finalise the minutes as quickly as possible each time.