

Action Points from the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group meeting held on the 7th September

Attendance

Malcolm Newing (Chair)
Greg Noble
Eileen Curry
Bon Hine
David Venn
Damian Willingale

Unable to attend

Craig Champion
Tracy Youngs
Nick Ellins
Andy Gardner
Michaela Gardner

1. Introduction

Malcolm explained that the grant application had gone in soon after the last meeting. He had applied for money to cover the OneillHomer latest budgeted plan and a further £2000. The decision should be made before the money is needed at the end of the year. O’NeillHomer had confirmed they are now operating to the new plan and budgeted costs.

2. Call For Sites

All the steering group members present provided their preference and prioritization for which sites should be included in the neighbourhood plan. The details of this can be found at Annex A.

Discussion took place on each site as follows

03 Newton Leys

It was noted that the information with respect to Newton Leys is different because the information available was largely supplied by parishioners in Stoke Hammond Village. The Exhibition in Newton Leys demonstrated that the two communities would view the sites very differently. The Newton Leys Exhibition showed that development of the site would be acceptable but only with a much reduced number of houses and more green and sports space. The decision was agreed unanimously to include Newton Leys in the plan with these caveats.

36 Land East of Fenney

Everyone included this site for inclusion in the plan. The site was high on the exhibition attendees' chosen sites and on the blended score provided by O'NeillHomer. It was agreed unanimously to include the site in the plan.

14 Hunters Lodge

Only Greg included Hunters Lodge for inclusion. He chose it because it represented infill within the current boundaries. The others however said the statistics from the exhibition were clear in that the community were opposed to development of the site. It was agreed to exclude Hunters Lodge from the plan.

29 North Of Old School Lane

Nobody had included this site in the plan. Malcolm asked whether there was any mileage in going back to the landowners stating that the proposed development was not supported but a very small development on the portion of land with the ruins on might be considered. Greg said this would fly in the face of the community response and would suggest it was being ignored. It was universally agreed not to include this site in the plan.

10 SW of Leighton Road

Only Eileen had included this site for inclusion. Her reasoning was it would be set away from the Village and might cause less offence. The other alternative perspective was that it would extend the village boundary and allow for much greater infill and this was opposed to the views expressed by the parishioners via the exhibition feedback. It was agreed not to include this site in the plan.

18 North of Harrup Close

The majority present favoured inclusion because it was a small plot, there was support at the exhibition and it represented classic infill. The site would be impacted by its closeness to a Grade 2 historic building. It was agreed to include this in the plan.

19 Back of Orchard End and Meadowside

The majority favoured inclusion of this site. It is largely an infill site with little visibility to parishioners. It is next to a site that has already been given planning permission and will be served by a new road due to be under construction shortly. It was agreed to include it in the plan.

5 Parish Council Land

Not unsurprisingly this led to an active discussion. There exists within the village significant emotional attachment to the existing Community Association building which at times makes use of the Parish land in question. On initial voting there was a 3-3 split on the inclusion or otherwise of the Parish Council land in the plan. Further discussion on the grounds for excluding the land revolved around possible impacts on the playground area and the loss of amenity. The counter argument was explained that the PC had only volunteered the land on the basis that the increased return on investment through developing the

plot would be put into creating more modern and better community facilities in the Bragenham Side field. Furthermore the exhibition had more votes in favour of development as a first choice than any other site except Newton Leys. It's true there was a substantial number of people who scored the land low down the list but it was not the highest in this respect. Failure to include the site at this stage would reflect a lost opportunity to fund improved recreational facilities (favoured by the parishioners as a use of the Bragenham Side field when the question was raised by both this and the last Parish Council) but also the opportunity to meet the Housing Needs Assessment for housing affordable to young/elderly parishioners wishing to stay in the village and also for an affordable sheltered accommodation for elderly residents. After this discussion the vote changed to 5-1 in favour of inclusion.

A number of further concerns were raised about the capability of the road network to support growth in Bragenhamside and the legal standing of the Parish Council land which currently prevents commercial development on the site. Malcolm explained that the decision today was on whether the site should be included for the benefit of the community and in keeping with the objectives of the Neighbourhood plan. All the sites would be subject to physical and legal issues with respect to their development which must be addressed in advance of the Pre Submission document being finalised or via the subsequent planning process when applications are received. We are enabling discussions with all the site owners to ascertain whether their plans can accommodate all aspects of the Neighbourhood Plan which would include HNA, design code, and transport policies as well as all the other policies that will be going into the Pre Submission plan. In addition, conversations can now take place with the Local authority on the terms of the agreement and whether the NP and the community feedback can be used to encourage a change in the existing legal requirements linked to the original purchase of the land. Other issues such as the timing of the removal of the playground area and commencement of any development were raised and are all valid concerns but should be dealt with as part of any finally agreed development proposals. It was agreed the site be included in the plan.

The decisions taken at the meeting enables the steering group to progress each site which depending on ongoing activity may still fall out before the final Pre Sub is completed at the end of the year. We are now able to contact all the site owners to notify them of our decision and to enter into discussions about how we expect their ongoing development decisions to take account of the policies within the developing Neighbourhood Plan. i.e HNA and Design codes. Contact with landowners to be carried out prior to notification of the Steering Group decision to the local community. **Action: Malcolm N**

3. Current Status of our Pre-Submission Plan

At the last meeting areas of responsibility were agreed for the updating and completion of the Policy areas in advance of final input from O'Neill Homer. The updated list is attached to this at Annex B.

We had previously determined that the Aylesbury Vale Local plan had sufficient content to offer protection on Geo diversity (landscape) and biodiversity issues. Malcolm suggested that as landscape, had been raised by the community as a key issue we should probably review that decision. The Steering group agreed with this recommendation. Damien agreed to review the topic area as per the following process agreed last meeting

- PSG Steering Group input to date
- Feedback received from the Exhibition.
- Comparison to another Neighbourhood Plan i.e Stewkley
- Comparison to AVDC Local Plan equivalent

and amend the Policy statement, description of its purpose and how it will be applied if felt necessary. **Action: Damian W**

The Links to the Stewkley Neighbourhood plan and the AVDC and Bucks local plans are at Annex C.

4 Next Meeting Date is as follows.

- 12thOctober (Zoom)

Annex A

Prioritisation of Call for Sites - Steering Group Analysis

	Site	David V	Eileen C	Bon H	Greg N	Damia n W	Malcolm N	Decision
3	West of Newton Leys	1	1		1	1	1	YES
18	North of Harrup Close			3	4	2	5	YES
36	Land off East of Fenney 1	2	2	2	3	4	2	YES
19	Back of Orchard End and Meadowside	3	3		2		4	YES
5	Parish Council Land			1		3	3	YES
10	SW of Leighton Road	4						NO
14	Hunters Lodge				5			NO
29	North of Old School Lane							

Annex B

Group Responsibilities

Task

- Review PSG Steering Group input to date
- Review Feedback received from the Exhibition.
- Do a comparison to another Neighbourhood Plan i.e Stewkley
- Do a comparison to AVDC Local Plan equivalent.
- Final draft of the Policy element of the Pre Submission document.

<u>Policies</u>	<u>SH</u>	<u>NL</u>
Settlement Boundaries	??	CC
Design Code	BH	CC
Local Heritage Assets	EC	X
Green Infrastructure	DV	CC
Sustainable Travel	GN	CC
Housing Mix	MN	CC
Passivhaus	X	X
Traffic management	GN	CC
Site Allocations	MN	CC
Biodiversity and Geo diversity	DW	X
<u>Other Pre-Submission Deliverables</u>		
Foreword	MN	
Introduction and Background	MN	
Neighbourhood area	Comp	
Planning Policy Content	Comp	
Community Views on Planning Issues	MN	
Vision Objectives	Comp	
Implementation	MN	
Policy Maps	Comp	
Appendices		
● Design Code	BH	
● Local Heritage assets	EC	
● Green Infrastructure element	DV	

Annex C

[Link to Stewkley Neighbourhood Plan](#)

<https://stewkley.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Stewkley-Parish-Neighbourhood-Plan-2019-05-14.pdf>

Link to AVDC Local Plan

https://buckinghamshire-gov-uk.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/Aylesbury_local_plan_L46JWaT.pdf

AVDC Local Plan Section

Settlement Boundaries	S3
Design Code	BE2
Local Heritage Assets	BE1
Green Infrastructure	I1
Sustainable Travel	T1 and T7
Housing Mix	H1
Passivhaus	
Traffic management	
Site Allocation	I3
Biodiversity and Geo diversity	NE1