

## **Action Points from the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group meeting held on the 8<sup>th</sup> June**

### **Attendance by Zoom**

Malcolm Newing (Chair)  
Michaela Gardner (part of the meeting)  
Greg Noble  
Eileen Curry  
Craig Champion  
Bon Hine

### **Unable to attend**

David Venn  
Damian Willingale  
Tracy Youngs  
Nick Ellins  
Andy Gardner

### **Neil Homer ( Consultant)**

#### **1. Introduction**

Malcolm explained that the formal consultation will move from June /July to September/October as the grant process has still not been announced by the government and so we will have had to stop paying for O’Neill Homer activity. This should not cause any issues as we have no time specific reasons for completing the NP before the end of the year. Depending on Government action delivering grant support we should be able to carry out formal consultation September/October.

#### **2. Call For Sites Analysis**

Malcolm reiterated the process, outlined last month, that had been used to analyse the community feedback from the two exhibitions held in Stoke Hammond and Newton Leys.

##### **2.1 Community Ranking**

Malcolm explained that the returns from the Stoke Hammond Exhibition had numbered 103 but 7 were spoilt papers. Mostly this was due to comments only being added that stated no development was acceptable, but some were because people only scored one or two of the sites.

Malcolm presented his analysis, which he confirmed had been advised as an acceptable methodology by Neil. The analysis is at Annex A. It has the data presented in 4 separate grids using different methodologies to rank the sites. They are colour coded such that for each grid red is the most favoured sites, brown is the next most favoured group and Green is the least favoured

### **Grid One**

The scores for each of the 8 sites from all returns were added up where the most favoured would be 1 and the least favoured would be 8. The sites are then ranked by totals with the assumption the lower the score the more favoured for inclusion and the higher the score the least favoured for inclusion. Not unsurprisingly given the makeup of residents attending, the Newton Leys site came up the most favoured by a long way. The least favoured were SW of Leighton Road, Hunters Lodge and North of Old School Lane.

### **Grid Two**

The methodology is the same as Grid one except the Newton Leys site was removed from the analysis and so the scores used were 1 to 7. This time the land East of Fenney and North Harrup close were the most favoured. The least favoured sites were the same as grid one.

### **Grid Three**

It is likely people were very clear the sites they either really liked or those they really didn't, with the remaining sites subject to less emphasis on people's individual ranking. The 3rd grid is therefore ranked on the most first and second nominations. In this case the land East of Fenney comes out most favoured with North Harrup and the Parish Council land a close second. The Parish Council land received more firsts than any other site.

### **Grid Four**

This grid is the converse of Grid 3 and ranks based on most 6's and 7's. The three sites that came out as causing the least concern were Back of Orchard End, North of Harrup Close and Land East of Fenney. All the other sites had numbers of people who were keen to exclude them from the process. The Parish council land is the nearest we have to a 'Marmite site' with 34 scoring 1 and 2 and 35 scoring 6 and 7. After a certain amount of discussion all members in attendance accepted the methodology and understood the rationale. Andy had requested the spreadsheet with the raw data was provided last month, which Malcolm had done.

When asked all those present said they understood the methodology used and had no queries on the data.

## **2.2 SEA Ranking**

Malcolm had only distributed the External SEA Assessment on the day of the last meeting including analysis for each site based on Landscape, Heritage, Biodiversity and Flood Risk.

Each element is graded as either Likely adverse effect (without mitigation measures), Neutral/no effect, Likely positive effect or Uncertain effect. There had been

insufficient time to read the document and to challenge any of the findings. Malcolm had requested that all steering group members vet the document and the individual site analysis. Whilst it had been produced by experts, it is possible that local knowledge might trump some of it. Noone had submitted any concerns and no one at the meeting wanted to raise any issues.

Malcolm said he had personally noted only one issue related to the Community Centre land. In the blended assessment it was showing for flooding that effect was neutral however in the actual SAE report there was a red warning. It related to the North part of the site being in Flood Plain 3. He understood this had been queried by O'NeilHomer. They were unconvinced it warranted a red rating.

### **2.3 Blended Ranking**

With the two component parts of the Blended ranking having been discussed, Malcolm asked if there were any comments on the Blended score. Greg and Michaela queried the exclusion of Grid one information from the Blended score, using Grid 2 excluding Newton Leys instead.

Malcolm explained that the purpose of the blended result was to provide clarity on the Parishioner view of the Stoke Hammond Sites specifically. As we know, the general view of all parishioners was they did not want any more development anywhere in the Parish. The exhibitions clearly indicated that if development had to occur then for Newton Leys residents, they would prefer it was in Stoke Hammond and conversely Stoke Hammond residents would prefer it was in Newton Leys. The task we were faced with, was determining which sites were considered most appropriate for inclusion in the NP the parishioner feedback received and the SEA information. The purpose was to have a defense through the Neighbourhood Plan, to ensure if the Bucks Local Plan gives us an allocation we can ensure it is filled with our preferred sites rather than random sites chosen by developers/landowners.

It was important to recognize we were not just picking one site; we were picking one or more sites that we considered would be supported when the NP was consulted upon with parishioners. The matrices and blended information were provided to aid our discussions and decision making. Grid two was used because it provided greater granularity on which sites Stoke Hammond residents were most concerned within Stoke Hammond itself.

Using grid one in the blended assessment won't change the prioritization of sites other than Newton Leys. Malcolm agreed however to produce the tables and a blended assessment using grid one and equivalent Grids 3 and 4 with Newton Leys included. **Action Malcolm N**

### **3 Housing Needs Assessment**

Malcolm asked people for their views on Housing Needs. We have our report which we need to reflect but recent applications have been skewed towards affordable housing and smaller houses. Bon commented that whilst the HNA referred to a need for smaller houses, recent developments such as Fenney and Brook Farm were significantly changing the mix. Greg said we should be looking to maintain a blend and Malcolm felt it was important that development recognized the shape and feel of the immediate locality. We needed to ensure a suitable form of words captured this in the NP. Malcolm would create an initial draft for consideration. **Action Malcolm N**

#### 4 Next Meeting Dates

The scheduled dates for NPSG meetings in 2023 are as follows.

- 6 th July
- 10 th August