

Action Points from the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group meeting held on the 4th May 2023.

Attendance

Malcolm Newing (Chair)
David Venn
Eileen Curry
Greg Noble
Damian Willingale
Craig Champion
Andy Gardner

Unable to attend

Tracy Youngs
Michaela Gardner
Nick Ellins
Bon Hine
Neil Homer (Consultant)

1. Introduction

Malcolm explained that the formal consultation will probably move from June /July to September/October as the grant process has not been announced by the government and so we will have to stop 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.

Malcolm stated the Exhibition had been a great success in March and we held one at Newton Leys the previous evening which had also been well received. The Stoke Hammond event had over 100 attendees but only two from Newton Leys. The Newton Leys event was smaller with 25 attendees but all from Newton Leys.

As residents of the Parish, they were all given the overall site prioritisation forms to complete. It was evident however that neither set of residents are familiar with the other village and the recommendation for planning clearly reflected this, with their own village being bottom of the list. This needs to be reflected in our own determination of what sites to include or not include in the Neighbourhood Plan.

2. Call For Sites Analysis

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 agreed 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 make up of residents attending, the Newton Leys site came up the most favoured by a long shot. 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 peoples 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. The remaining sites all came out significantly lower than the top 3.

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 requested the spreadsheet with the raw data be provided. **Action : Malcolm N**

2.2 SEA Ranking

Malcolm had distributed the External SEA Assessment earlier in the day including analysis for each site based on Landscape, Heritage, Bio Diversity 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 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. **Action : Steering Group Members**

Neil and his team have taken the SEA rankings and our community rankings and created a blended ranking which is at Annex B. They excluded West of Newton Leys and concluded as an initial recommendation that East of Fenny Road, Land adjoining the Community Association, North of Harrup Close and Orchard End are the sites that should remain in our proposed list and the other 3 sites should be excluded.

3. Other Considerations

Malcolm asked people to raise any issues that they either wanted clarified or felt had been overlooked for consideration, outside of the already agreed review of the steering group document. **Action: Steering Group Members**

The following issues were raised during the meeting.

3.1 Relationship with Bucks Call for Sites. Andy wanted to understand the relationship between our exercise and the Bucks Local Plan Call for sites exercise which had received submissions from all around the village and looked to be more focussed on the North Bucks region than South, particularly in and around Stoke Hammond. Malcolm explained that the Bucks document was simply a long list without there having been any analysis yet. A better steer will come in December when the first cut view will be presented by Bucks following analysis. Andy was concerned that if Bucks determined to build all over the Church land what impact would our Neighbourhood Plan have ? Malcolm explained that our Plan has three elements that will carry weight to protect the wider areas of the Parish. We have policies on the Village Boundary, on what building will be allowed beyond the boundary in rural areas and on the impact on the setting of the Village from all approaches. If Bucks determine a strategic site, then our NP would be an addition to all the other planning documentation that any action groups might use to fight against such a development. The Neighbourhood Plan comes into its own however if a small 80 to 100 site development is proposed as an add on to the village if we can offer a site or sites, we consider more appropriate and they are included in our plan.

By way of these minutes, I'll ask Neil to confirm my comments are accurate. **Action Malcolm N**

3.2 Site Volumes. Damian says he was concerned that the chosen sites will not deliver sufficient volumes for our possible contribution to the future Bucks Local Plan. The four selected sites contribute 63 houses. We won't know if this enough until we receive an allocation which is some way off. In our call for sites letter we said we were looking for around 50 so not that far off. Damian wanted to know if there was, anyway, we could reconsider adding Hunters Lodge into the mix as it received a positive SEA report and would provide 40 to 70 houses ? I said this needs checking with Neil, but I think it creates an issue if we chose to ignore the data we have gathered. This causes two problems, firstly there was a strong resistance to Hunters Lodge amongst residents which would likely be reflected in the consultation and secondly if you ignore the data for one site it would provide the opportunity for other site owners to cry foul. Malcolm to check with Neil. **Action: Malcolm N**

3.3 Land behind the Community Centre Malcolm said the parish land is subject to covenants placed by the Council when purchased. This would need removing if it was to be developed. Malcolm would approach the Council to check if this would be possible. **Action: Malcolm N**

3.5 Community Centre Greg said that access to the Parish land would have to be negotiated with the Community Association. This was noted.

3.4 Written Feedback from Residents Craig said that there was feedback from residents on some of the forms and we should check that if there was any site-specific information that should be reflected in our decision-making process. **Action: Malcolm N**

4. Newton Leys

We presented the full exhibition material at the Newton Leys meeting on the 4th May. Several prioritisation forms were completed, and the results are attached at Annex C. Except for 1 person, they all put Newton Leys as Choice 8 on the form. They then completed the others in descending order on the form. Unsurprisingly they all commented they don't know the sites in the village to have an informed view. The prioritisation consequently carries little value other than to show NL residents don't want the proposed West of Newton Leys development offered.

We provided another form for comment. This had three options for the West of Newton Leys land. These were A the site owners offer which represented 80:20 split housing to recreation activities with approx. 115 houses. B Craigs request to the site owners for sports pitches and a 60:40 split with 85 houses. C Craigs enhanced request with a 50:50 split and 70 houses. They were asked to say which options were acceptable and which were not. The data is at Annex D and shows 0% would accept the current offer, 38% would accept Craigs initial idea and 69% would accept the

enhanced offer. The outtake from this is that if the Stoke Hammond Residents desire to make West of Newton Leys first choice for inclusion in the plan, the Newton Leys Residents would vote against the plan. If the plan can be significantly amended, then Newton Leys residents and Stoke Hammond Residents might both be in favour. A conversation with the landowners is required to progress this matter. We need some guidance from Neil on this. **Action: Malcolm N**

5. Dates of Next Meeting

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

- 8th June (Zoom)
- 6th July
- 10th August

Malcolm Newing
6th May

Annex 1

Settlement

O/S recreation and community and open spaces around edge of settlement boundary
Restrictions on commercial builds within X metres of the settlement boundary

Design code
Height restrictions of 2.5 stories
Density of bedrooms per hectare
Matching bricks

Green infrastructure
X% of area of development to include green infrastructure of continuous green/ open space
Replace any green infrastructure with 150% of replacements
Maintain visibility and access over water course
Protect views around church from the road

Sustainable travel
Cycling infrastructure with an aim to link to the redways
Increased bus routes
MK connect type service.to be funded
Widen towpath for cycling
Fill in the missing sections of the Footpath along the main road in the village.

Housing mix
Sheltered accommodation
Blended mix of X% of different house sizes styles bungalows.apartment

Traffic management
Better than AVDC policy.
Avoiding back to back parking (must be side to side).
Minimum visitor parking allocation and max distance from houses
EV charging requirements - two.chargenpoints more than 2 beds
Three phase public on street charging
Improve safety for Newton Leys estate if any development within that area
Sight lines for estate entrance/ exit to be at least X metres.
Don't leave open access to further sites

Site allocation

SH10
Shops, sports club, pub, protected community assets

Service provision
Full fibre broadband connection for each residence on new developments
Street lighting design to be good