

Notes from Meeting with HDC on 16th April re Silver Street Development.

- BPC registered concern that all documents relevant to the application, have not been forwarded to the council or made available on the web site. Aaron (AS) advised that there had been a period where IT failure had led to some documents not being loaded but believed everything was now posted. AS to confirm that any perceived late response from BPC on documents (E.g. CCC Transport Response) not seen on the portal will not be detrimental to BPC's submission.
- BPC are particularly concerned about compliance with Buckden's Neighbourhood Plan and had forwarded a document to AS expressing our views about compliance. To date, no response has been received to this document and no evidence of compliance with NP policies has yet been provided by HDC.
- BPC referred to AS E Mail dated 11th Feb which included the following '*I have raised queries with the developer on some of the policies within the Neighbourhood Plan and have received some further information that I am in the process of initially reviewing before it is formally accepted and sent out for wider consultation*'. In the meeting AS referred to discussions with the developer about the NP (e.g. Viability). There is no record of the outcome of these meetings on the web site.
- Of particular concern is the impact on local roads. (Transport Policy 1.) There are several junctions e.g. Silver Street and Church Road, referenced specifically in the Policy. BPC would like to see the specific evidence (E.g. modelled junction RFC values and traffic light DDOS values) that demonstrates compliance with this Policy.
- AS confirmed that the developer did not believe that the NP made the development unviable.
- BPC raised concerns that the traffic data had only been projected to 2026, despite a recommendation from AECOM, the consultants to HE, that it was projected to 2036. BPC asked if the impact of the A428/Black Cat development had been included in the projections. AS responded that the strategic development of the A1 would supersede this report. BPC had previously been advised that any redevelopment of the A1 would be many years away and that it was not included in current plans. BPC would like clarification of what is planned and when. AS to clarify what strategic development of the A1 would supersede this report.
- BPC raised concern that the developer had rejected all requests for CIL funded projects. AS advised that BPC could raise high priority projects again.
- The development will remove the parking area and the storage buildings for the allotments. AS suggested that there would be replacement parking and funds to recompense for the loss of storage buildings. BPC requested confirmation of the compensation/mitigation for this.
- AS confirmed that funding for the school expansion had been included, and that an amount of £128k had been included for expansion of the GP surgery. This appears to be a very small budget to achieve the level of expansion required. BPC will discuss with the Managing Partner.

- BPC raised the issue of increased pollution resulting from more stationary vehicles on the A1. AS advised that HE did not think this would breach guidelines. In relation to the High Street and Perry Road, AS advised that HDC monitoring was on going. BPC understood that no pollution monitoring had taken place due to equipment failure. AS will check and report on the past, current and future plans for pollution monitoring of Buckden and the roundabout traffic.