

Action Points from the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group meeting (Brown Team Session) held on the 9th February 2022.

Attendance

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

Unable to attend

Tracy Youngs
Michaela Gardner
Nick Ellins
Neil Homer

1. Introduction

Malcolm explained we had a busy 6 months ahead but were in the heart of plan production. The agenda would address the final call for site list, Locality were focusing on the Strategic Site Assessment technical work and we would be testing policy ideas and the short list of sites with the community weekend 25th and 26th March, he would need everyone's help to make this a success.

The end game will be worthwhile, as we'll have a planning document that was Stoke Hammond specific and would carry weight on all future planning applications.

2. Call For Sites

We had started out the process with 29 landowners and 37 parcels of land. The list had been whittled down over time by

- Nil replies
- Owners not interested in development
- Landlocked sites
- Owners unable to provide a simple site with house numbers and access
- Those who have submitted a planning application

We now had 7 Landowners and 9 parcels of land. (Annex A). The group reviewed the sites with a view to signing them off for sharing with the local parishioners in the March Exhibition.

This created a fair amount of debate and raised the following issues

- What if the sites might not be deliverable because of restricted covenants? Malcolm explained that following the prioritisation of sites based on the exhibition feedback, and then the Steering group using the parish feedback, the SEA prioritisation and legal constraints will carry out a final prioritisation. If a site looks to have significant delivery issues based on any of the three areas they will be dropped to provide site allocation for the plan.
- What will the residents be basing their views on particularly as sites left vary in size from 8/9 up to 80? ? The basic answer to this is whatever criteria are important to them. This will be personal and could revolve around a whole host of concerns. The important thing is for the SG to be able to gauge a prioritised site preference.
- What will the system be for people to state their preference? This is something for the team to consider and agree. **Action All.** Malcolm will find out from Neil Homer how it has been done elsewhere. **Action Malcolm N**
- There was concern that the audience will need a fair amount of explanation over the Call for Site Process. This was agreed and would be a function of pre event Comms and SG members on the day.
- Little Acre had ruled itself out by putting in a planning application. Did that mean 10 SW of Leighton Road was excluded as it was cut adrift from the Settlement boundary? Malcolm thought this was the case however he would double check with Neil Homer. **Action: Malcolm N**

There was a specific issue over the site 5 The Parish Community Centre Land. The plan that had been produced had inadvertently included Community Association owned land. The Parish Council wished to keep the land in the process but it wouldn't be shared with the SG or shown at the exhibition and till the plan had been redrawn and the restrictive covenant in the deeds was resolved. It was stressed that the agreement to include it had been on the basis that if the land were given up it would only be if the benefits in terms of land and facilities are better than those used for development. It was recognised that the earlier Parish plans for a new Village Hall or something similar was unlikely be funded in any other way.

3. **Policy Review**

After the site allocation issues, the next most important issue is fleshing out the Policy statements. As Neil explained these are the key elements of the plan that can potentially provide a more significant say for the parish in many aspects of any future developments, not just site allocation.

We took the opportunity to brainstorm a few ideas. (Annex 2). This clearly showed there were significant ideas the team would like to test with Neil and his team.

It was agreed that everyone would go away and look at the specific areas and come back with ideas to be discussed at the next meeting.

Communication

The date of the exhibition had been advertised in the SH News. As discussed previously we need to revisit the focus of our communication so people have some idea of what to expect and to feel the need to visit.

The team were asked to consider some ideas on what else we could share at the exhibition or consult on that would maximise our return beyond simply a prioritisation of the Site List. **Action All**

4. Dates of Next Meeting

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

- 21st February
- 9th March
- 6th April
- 4th May
- 8th June
- 6th July
- 10th August

Malcolm Newing
10th February

ANNEX 1

Short List of Sites following first review

- 3 West of Newton Leys (previously named 'Borough Farm')
- 5 Land Adjoining Community Association
- 10 SW of Leighton Road
- 14 Hunters Lodge
- 18 North of Harrup Close (previously 'Rear of Lodge Lane')
- 19 Orchard End
- 21 Tumbleweed
- 29 North of Old School Lane (previously 'Rosebank')
- 36 East of Fenny Road 1 (previously 'Tyrells')

For consideration as Sports and Recreation only as a separate exercise

- 2 Northern Field (previously named 'Rectory Farm') but see below
- 29 North of Old School Lane part 2 (previously 'Rosebank', part beyond the land adjacent to Old School Lane)
- 35 West of the Canal (previously 'Kesslers') but with its boundary amended to include the land to its east up to the canal, b

ANNEX 2

Policy Brainstorm Output

- Additional electric charging points on new estates
- For a set number of houses, green space must be included
- Less density based on bedrooms per hectare
- Parking spaces
- More per house
- No tandem parking
- Make Meadowcroft approach to cul de sacs the norm
- New estates to fill cul de sac not leave as access roads