



STEWKLEY PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN



Consultation Statement

March 2020

**Published by Stewkley Parish Council under the Neighbourhood Planning
(General) Regulations 2012 and in accordance with EU Directive 2001/42**



Table of Contents

| | | |
|------------|---|-----------|
| I | Introduction | 3 |
| II | Neighbourhood Area Designation | 3 |
| III | Dateline of Main Events | 4 |
| IV | The Consultation process | 6 |
| 1.0 | Public Consultation 07 December 2015 | 6 |
| 2.0 | Questionnaire | 7 |
| 3.0 | Open Meetings | 9 |
| 4.0 | Call for Sites and identification of all potential sites – August 2016 | 14 |
| 5.0 | Parish Survey | 14 |
| 6.0 | AVDC NP Support Team and other departments | 15 |
| 7.0 | Strategic Environmental assessment | 19 |
| 8.0 | Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation | 19 |
| V | The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group | 22 |
| VI | Appendices | 23 |
| | Appendix 1 The Questionnaire | 24 |
| | Appendix 2 Open Meeting: 16 May 2016 Collated Comments | 30 |
| | Appendix 3 Open meeting: 11 october 2016 comments | 36 |
| | Appendix 4 FAQs developed in response to emails | 38 |
| | Appendix 5 Open meeting: 11 March 2017 collated comments | 40 |
| | Appendix 6 Site Decision Making Table | 41 |
| | Appendix 7 Open meeting: 15 July 2017 collated comments | 44 |
| | Appendix 8 Collated feedback from AVDC departments | 45 |
| | Appendix 9 Statutory consultees | 49 |
| | Appendix 10 Spreadsheet of comments & responses to Reg 14 consultation | 50 |



I INTRODUCTION

This Report provides the details of the consultation process undertaken as part of the development of the Stewkley Parish Neighbourhood Plan (SPNP), as required by the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. Stewkley Parish Council (SPC) and the Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group (NPSG) have been working on the development of the SPNP since December 2015 and have undertaken a series of public consultations.

The legal basis of this Report is provided by Section 15 (2) of part 5 of the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations, which requires that a consultation report should:-

- I. Contain details of the persons and bodies consulted about the proposed Neighbourhood Plan;
- II. Explain how they were consulted;
- III. Summarise the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and,
- IV. Describe how those issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.

II NEIGHBOURHOOD AREA DESIGNATION

Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC) formally designated the Parish of Stewkley as a 'Neighbourhood Planning Area' on the 4th May 2016.

Figure 1 shows the boundary of the Neighbourhood Planning Area and therefore the extent to which the Plan and its policies relate.




Figure 1: The designated area of the Parish of Stewkley

III DATELINE OF MAIN EVENTS

| Date | Event | Purpose of meeting or outcome |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| 5 October 2015 | SPC agenda item – Neighbourhood Plan | Resolution to consult village on the creation of a Neighbourhood Plan |
| 7 December 2015 | Public consultation Stewkley Village Hall | Support from parishioners for the creation of a Neighbourhood Plan |
| 8 January 2016 | SPC meet with volunteers from the village willing to help with the Neighbourhood Plan | Chairman of the NPSG elected. Decision to survey parish with a questionnaire. |
| Jan – March 2016 | NPSG formed | Members selected to represent SPC and parishioners. |
| 3 rd March 2016 | First NPSG meeting | Terms of reference developed. |
| Jan - March 2016 | Questionnaire | Questionnaire was developed and distributed to all households. 80% returned completed, giving comprehensive and current information about parishioners' life in Stewkley |



Stewkley Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement

| | | |
|-------------------|--|---|
| Feb - April 2016 | Working Group and Chairs identified | <p>The following nine Working Groups were identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing, environment, landscape and planning • Conservation and heritage • Roads and Infrastructure • Elderly and disabled • Amenities • Nursery and Primary Education • Sport and Recreation • Economy and Employment • Youth <p>Working group membership was established and the scope of group activity defined.</p> |
| 16 May 2016 | Open Meeting | Feedback from questionnaire and consultation of the proposed scope of the Working Groups used to inform the Plan development. |
| July 2016 | Parishioner one to one meetings with NPSG chairman | Opportunity for individuals to give feedback to the NPSG chairman – used to inform the Plan development. |
| August 2016 | Call for Sites | Landowners put forward plots of land for consideration to be included in the Neighbourhood Plan. |
| 02 September 2016 | Have your Say on proposed Soulbury Road development. Opportunity taken to poll parishioners on their preference for large or small developments. | Preference for small developments and preservation of the linear and ribbon development that defines the parish of Stewkley (SPC meeting minutes 5 September 2016). |
| 11 October 2016 | Open Meeting | <p>Consultation on the 'long list' of sites put forward for possible development.</p> <p>All sites, if supported by their landowners, were included in this initial presentation.</p> <p>Parishioner feedback on all sites was collected, and used to develop the short list.</p> |
| 11 March 2017 | Open Meeting | Consultation on proposed sites, policy statements drafted by the Working Groups, and the proposed settlement boundary. Feedback from villagers was collected and used to inform the development of the Plan. |
| 15 July 2017 | Open Meeting | Presentation of detail on sites expected to be included in the draft |



| | | |
|-------------------------------|---|---|
| | | Neighbourhood Plan, including some outline development plans where available. Updated Plan policies were also available for comment including the proposed settlement boundary. Feedback from villagers was collected. |
| November 2017 | Parish-wide survey on VALP reduction in houses required to be built in Stewkley (reduced from 141 to 101) | Villagers voted by 2/3 votes cast to 1/3 to develop a Neighbourhood Plan for Stewkley and not just to meet the VALP housing requirement of 101 houses. NPSG agreed at meeting on 20 November 2017 to recommend Option 3 to SPC. |
| 4 th December 2017 | SPC meeting | Ratify decision to pursue Option 3 |
| August - November 2018 | Draft policy review and comment requested from relevant AVDC departments. | Feedback on draft policies obtained from AVDC Neighbourhood Planning, Heritage, Development and Bucks CC transport and highways. |
| 17 June – 28 July 2019 | Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation | Feedback from the draft Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documentation was received from many of the statutory consultees, including Stewkley parishioners. . |

IV THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

1.0 PUBLIC CONSULTATION 07 DECEMBER 2015

All Stewkley parishioners were invited to attend the public meeting on 7 December 2015. An advert with an editorial piece was placed in the monthly village newsletter, the Grapevine which is delivered free to all households, a tri-fold leaflet was hand delivered to every household, and a banner was hung in front of the village hall advertising the meeting. Over 250 parishioners attended. Stewkley Parish Council chaired the meeting which included oral presentations, a Question and Answer session and some posters attached around the hall walls explaining the steps in the process of creating a Neighbourhood Plan.

Although not planned, this public consultation was held days after a rumour had been confirmed of the sale of a farmer's field on the Soulbury Road for housing. This development, if realised, would be 3 to 4 times larger than any other within Stewkley, and it was clear from the questions raised that this fuelled the interest in the public meeting.



The Draft Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP) had identified Stewkley as a medium sized village, and allocated 141 new homes to be built, equivalent to a 19% increase over existing number of homes, within the period of the VALP.

At the end of the meeting, a show of hands indicated that the overwhelming majority of the attendees were in favour of a Neighbourhood Plan.

Volunteer sign-up sheets were available for anyone who was interested in being involved. Those people who gave their contact details were invited to an inaugural planning meeting on January 8 2016.

At the 8 January meeting, a chairman of the Steering Group was elected and other members of the Steering Group were nominated and selected. The chairman had the support of SPC because, in addition to his leadership skills from his professional experience, he had previously lead the working party responsible for organising the very successful 2012 Queen's Diamond Jubilee celebrations in Stewkley. The Steering Group members were selected as a mixture of villagers with a particular area of interest (e.g. family history, protection of the elderly and disabled, country pursuits and planning) and parish councillors.

The first decisions made were to (1) create Working Groups who would research and report back to the NPSG on their specific topics or area of expertise, and (2) to distribute a questionnaire to every household within the parish to obtain up to date information on Stewkley residents.

Several parishioners volunteered to participate in Working Groups, and one group volunteered to develop a parish questionnaire.

2.0 QUESTIONNAIRE

At the outset of the Planning process in 1Q 2016, a questionnaire was devised and circulated to all households within the Parish of Stewkley. The intent of this questionnaire was two-fold: to provide some basic statistics, which could be cross-referenced with the 2011 census, and to provide some aspirational insights, which the census did not provide.



The questionnaire was prepared by a group of 4 volunteers, one of whom was experienced in data collection, management and analysis. Several resources were consulted, including a questionnaire conducted for the 2010 Stewkley Parish Plan and material available on parish websites that had been used by other authorities in the creation of their NPs. The team drafted a set of 34 questions and the data analyst ensured that the questions asked would generate data that would be both analysable and useful. The draft document was reviewed by the NPSG and the Parish Council in February 2016, changes made following the review comments, and a final draft accepted by the NPSG and SPC, see Appendix 1.

The questionnaire was printed on A4 paper for distribution, and also made available on the parish council website, or from the parish clerk, in large print.

The questions covered the following topics:

- Current homes, occupancy and demographic data
- Education
- Employment
- Transport and vehicle ownership
- Environment, recreation and green spaces
- Amenities
- Opportunities for youth
- Future housing needs
- Reasons for living in Stewkley

A distribution list of 691 homes was developed from the 2014-2015 electoral register, and it was hand delivered to all houses by a team of 24 volunteers, who also collected the responses from their allocated houses. The 2011 census recorded 713 houses with at least one resident. This represents 22 houses (3%) less on the electoral register than accounted for in the census. Households were given approximately 2 weeks to complete the questionnaire, and volunteers made up to three attempts to retrieve the completed document. In total, 553 were completed: an 80% response rate which represented 1419 Parish residents.



A data entry spreadsheet was developed by the data analyst and the combined datasets were quality controlled and subjected to data logic checks prior to analysis by the expert volunteer.

The results were presented at an Open Meeting in May 2016.

3.0 OPEN MEETINGS

3.1 16 May 2016

The invitation to the Open Meeting was published on the front page of the May 2016 Grapevine. The displays were available to view from 12 noon until 8pm and the feedback and analysis of the questionnaire was provided as a slide presentation at two separate times (15.45h and 19.00h), with Question and Answer sessions hosted by the Chairman of the NPSG and another NP volunteer. There was no formal count of the number of parishioners who came in over the course of the 8 hours.

Working Groups representing the following nine subject areas had been developing a scope for their research.

Housing, environment, landscape and planning
Conservation and heritage
Roads and Infrastructure
Elderly and disabled
Amenities
Education
Sport and Recreation
Business and enterprise
Youth

Each of these groups presented their proposed scope of research on posters, and villagers were invited to add their comments and observations. These comments were collated and provided to the chairs of each of the Working Groups for consideration and possible inclusion in their research. Of note, the housing group asked the following questions:

- Where, within the Parish, do you think 'sustainable sites' for new dwellings could be



located?

- What are your thoughts on the 4 sites put forward by Stewkley Parish landowners for dwellings within the AVDC Local Plan 2017 (66 High Street North (HSN), Wilkinsons site at the end of Sycamore Close, the Soulbury Road 'field' site, the High Street South (HSS) site adjacent to the Carpenter's Arms)?
- Should we build out along/ beyond the existing roads into/ out from Stewkley?
- Do you think we should build on agricultural land to accommodate future dwellings over the next 20 years, if so where?
- What type of accommodation should be provided for the elderly, start-ups and where should these be located?
- Do you think making the village feel more like a village (e.g. Change of road surface material, more landscape) and not a through road could prevent speeding traffic?
- Should we create landscape 'gateways' to the village to emphasise the village of Stewkley?
- Should we enhance key nodes with a landscape solution (e.g HSN/ Dunton Road junction, War Memorial, The Swan/ Village Hall, Dean Road/ Bletchley Road HSN junction)?

The collated comments are attached in Appendix 2.

3.2 02 September 2016

The meeting was called by Stewkley Parish Council to get feedback on an outline planning application for an 85-house development on the Soulbury Road. As this was a site listed on AVDC HELAA (Housing & Economic Land Availability Assessments) and included in the list of sites for the NP, the opportunity was taken to ask some questions that would provide further information for the NP.

People who attended the meeting were asked their preference on how Stewkley delivered the 141 houses required by VALP. The options were a number of small developments spread across the parish, and using in-fill where possible, or larger developments in open spaces.

Seventy-seven per cent (77%) voted for small developments protecting the linear form of the parish, see SPC meeting minutes 05 September 2016.



Information was also gathered on the numbers of cars using each of the five roads leading out of the village by people commuting to work. The data indicated a uniform spread of traffic using all exit roads. This informal survey was later supplemented by MVAS traffic movements which supported the findings and are reported in the Roads and Infrastructure working group report.

3.3. 11 October 2016

The meeting was held between 19.00 and 21.00h and approximately 110 villagers were present. Invitation to the meeting was made via a front page article in the October Grapevine. The purpose of this consultation was two-fold: to obtain feedback from the community on the drafted policy statements that had been developed by each of the Working Groups; and to present the unedited 'long list' of possible sites for development that had been identified through the Call for Sites activities.

There were 30 sites on the long list. An initial evaluation of these sites had been made by a sub group of the NPSG, looking at the following criteria:

- Protection of linear nature of the village;
- Protection of rural nature of the village;
- Protection of countryside views;
- Impact of traffic and parking on residents;
- Enhancing the village character;
- Protection of green spaces and environment;
- Meeting village requirements in home types; and
- Avoidance of large developments (more than 8 homes in one area).

This evaluation scored each site on a sliding scale according to any impact the site would have in meeting the village needs.

As a result of this triage, sites were assigned traffic light colours by NPSG as follows: Green represented a possible site; yellow/orange represented a site with issues that would need to be overcome and red represented sites that were considered by NPSG to be unfavourable. The individual site information sheets displayed at the meeting included this assignment.

The meeting provoked a lot of discussion, as reported in the November Grapevine and there were several comments and questions recorded, see Appendix 3.

In early November 2016, a Neighbourhood Plan email address was established. From



November to the end of 2016, 40 emails were recorded, the majority of which were responding to the October Open meeting and the follow up report in the Grapevine.

Significant themes arising from the emails, comments and discussion were:

- Disagreement with the allocated 'green' sites;
- Number and type of sites / homes proposed;
- Affordability of the new homes.

To address the first point, all thirty sites were assessed by independent planners and the AVDC Neighbourhood Planning team. The independent planners visited the sites in person, AVDC completed a desk review. As a result of this additional information, and taking into consideration the feedback from the Open Meeting, the list of potential sites was reduced from 30 to 28. Sites were no longer differentiated using the traffic light system, nor pre-determined as favourable or unfavourable by NPSG, however the sites on site location maps used in future displays continued to be coloured in.

The updated site details, including the external reviewer comments, were available for review on the parish council website from January 2017. The Neighbourhood Plan email in-box continued to receive comments about the individual sites up to March 2017.

In response to the emails sent to Stewkleynp@gmail.com, a frequently asked questions (FAQ) section was created on the website. Appendix 4 lists the questions raised and answered in the FAQs.

3.4 11 March 2017

Invitations to the 11 March 2017 exhibition (billed as the final opportunity to comment on the potential sites) were hand-delivered to every household in the parish, printed in the March Grapevine and posted on the village noticeboards.

The exhibition consisted of the drafted text of the NP policies, as well as detail of the 28 sites which were printed on A1 posters. A representative outline of the settlement boundary was also on display.



Parishioners were invited to leave comments on the day or over a comment period that closed on April 15. By the close of the comment period, more than 600 comments had been received on the proposed sites, and over 100 comments on the drafted policies or settlement boundary, see Appendix 5.

The comments on the policies were handed to the Working Group chairs who made revisions to the report or policy wording where appropriate.

Site comments were tabulated and discussed at a meeting of the NPSG on 08 May 2017. An objective decision matrix was created that took into consideration all the feedback obtained to date, and a final list of 13 sites was selected to move forward into the NP, see Appendix 6. The NPSG resolved to recommend this list to the parish council for their agreement at the meeting on the 5th June 2017. One site (NP03) was highlighted for further evaluation, as concerns were raised about the impact of loss of views. It was included in July 2017, making the total number of sites 14.

3.5 15 July 2017

Parishioners were invited to an open meeting on the 15th July by means of a flyer distributed to every household, an article in the Grapevine, the Stewkley NP Facebook page and the parish council website. This meeting was an opportunity for villagers to meet with the landowners of the proposed sites, and in some circumstances view proposed outline plans for the plot, and have another opportunity to comment on the settlement boundary. More than 250 people attended, and 85 comments were submitted, see Appendix 7.

Subsequent to this meeting, one site was removed from the list. The development of the site was dependent upon the owner confirming that well established chestnut trees, that would need to be removed, were diseased. This assurance was not received.

Thirty comments were received on the boundary. Twenty four (80%) were favourable. Of the unfavourable comments, the majority again identified where the line had been drawn through or excluded an existing building or proposed sites. These errors were corrected.



4.0 CALL FOR SITES AND IDENTIFICATION OF ALL POTENTIAL SITES – AUGUST 2016

Potential sites for development were identified via the following routes:

Route 1: Sites identified by AVDC in their call for sites and the May 2016 HELAA v3

Route 2: A local Call for Sites publicised via the village magazine (the Grapevine) in August 2016 and on village notice boards.

Route 3: NPSG members with local knowledge of parish landowners who had not responded to the Call for Sites, and had land potentially suitable for development.

Fifty three sites within the parish of Stewkley were identified via these three routes, and entered onto a Master List. Each site was assigned an identifying number (1 to 53).

During August and September 2016, initial discussions were held between NPSG and the landowners of the fifty three sites to clarify the purpose and intent of the Neighbourhood Plan, and the potential for development on that landowner's site. As a result of this consultation, 23 sites were removed from the Master List and 30 sites went forward in the selection process.

The identities and locations of the 23 sites that were not formally considered by the Neighbourhood Plan team are not recorded here. Sixteen of these sites had been identified via Route 3, and the landowners had no plans for development. The remainder were not followed up either because the land owner was not known, or the site was deemed unsuitable.

5.0 PARISH SURVEY

As SPC embarked on the development of its Neighbourhood Plan in 2016, a housing target of 141 homes had been published for Stewkley in the draft Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP). This target represented our contribution to the district housing supply for the 20 year duration of the VALP (2019 - 2039). By 4Q 2017, when the revised VALP was published for consultation, this target was reduced to 101.

The NPSG and SPC understood that the VALP and the Stewkley NP would be reviewed periodically after adoption, and if necessary, revised if local housing requirements increased.



However, it was felt that the parish should be allowed to have their say on the number of houses included in the Stewkley NP.

A survey was conducted over a period of 2 weeks during November 2017. Parishioners were given 3 options and asked to vote for one. Each of the three scenarios was described with some 'high level' positive and negative statements – these were not intended to be, nor represented as, a comprehensive assessment of the pros and cons of each option.

The options were to develop a NP for the planning period up to 2039:

1. That delivers the VALP target of 101 homes;
2. That builds ~ 127 homes, which would exclude certain sites that had been identified along the high street;
3. That builds ~ 150 homes currently identified in the drafted NP

Over 2/3 of the votes were cast for Options 2 and 3, meaning that the majority did not want to develop a NP to satisfy the current VALP but wanted to pursue a higher target of new builds that met the forecasted needs of Stewkley, and cover some potential growth in the VALP. As Option 3 narrowly scored higher than Option 2, the NPSG unanimously agreed to advise the Parish Council to proceed with Option 3 which was duly ratified at a Parish Council meeting in 4th December 2017.

6.0 AVDC NP SUPPORT TEAM AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS

The NPSG agreed at its meeting in June 2018 to submit its drafted policies and justifications to the NP Support Team at AVDC. A 21 page document was emailed to them in July which contained all the policies and justification statements, extracted directly from the draft Plan.

A response was received on 15 August 2018, which made some material observations, and recommended we get input at this stage from other relevant AVDC departments, including Development Management, Heritage, Landscape and Highways. This input was requested, and comments were received over the course of 3 months and incorporated into the draft Neighbourhood Plan as follows.

NP support team:



The NP support team embedded 33 written comments into the 21 page policy document. The comments fell into several broad categories as shown in the table.

| Type of comment | Comment number(s) | NPSG response |
|--|--|---|
| Guidance on presenting information within sections of the SPNP | BS1, BS4, BS6, BS7, BS8, BS10, BS16, BS17, BS23, BS26, | Noted and actioned as appropriate. |
| Not appropriate policy wording as written | BS2, BS5, BS12, BS29, BS30 | Reword policy or take appropriate alternative action. |
| Request for clarification to be given in Plan | BS3, BS22, BS24, | Clarification provided in Plan |
| Request for specific wording with the SPNP | BS9, BS11 | Wording changed as requested. |
| Recommendation to consult other Made NPs with similar challenges. | BS12, BS20, BS21, BS27, BS28, BS29, BS30 | Noted and actioned. |
| Suggestion to consult with other AVDC departments | BS13, BS14, BS15 | Actioned |
| Site or policy specific queries requiring clarification of policy wording and/or justification | BS18, BS19, BS24, BS25, BS31, BS32, BS33, | Noted and actioned. |

Heritage:

A heritage officer from AVDC offered the following feedback:

1. Prefer non-designated heritage assets where currently worded non-listed heritage assets



2. Reminder to incorporate and apply NPPF references and tests of community benefit versus substantial harm relating to the conservation and heritage policies.

Development management:

| Site location number | DM Comment | NPSG response |
|----------------------|--|--|
| NP01 and NP02 | North side Bletchley Road – Concerns over these allocations: Questioned why this didn't form part of allocation with NP02. Outside of the built-up part of the settlement and not infill. Likely landscape and countryside edge visual impact. Agricultural farm, potential amenity impact through noise and disturbance etc. Maybe some potential for limited frontage development. | Frontal development planned. Recognise need for a LVIA to be done. |
| NP03 | South side Bletchley Road – As above, in terms of beyond built-up part of the settlement but potential for some limited frontage development. | As above. |
| NP04 | Bowls Farm, High Street North (HELAA not suitable) – Showing agricultural buildings kept? Need to clarify extent of site allocation. CA impact? Access close to existing dwellings, impact on amenity. Not linear development. | Noted. It is recognised that development on this site would need careful consideration and design to incorporate highways, heritage and conservation concerns. |
| NP05 | Cricketers, High Street North – Outline approved and ADP in so principle accepted, subject to detail. | Noted |
| NP06 | Soulbury Road – Outline approved so principle accepted, subject to detail. | Noted |
| NP07 | Wing Road – Outside of built up part, not infill. CA impact? Not following field boundaries. Significant landscape impact, very open views, prominent. Potential for very limited frontage impact given development opposite. | Frontal development planned. Recognise need for a LVIA to be done. |
| NP08 | Wing Road – as above | Frontal development planned. Recognise need for a LVIA to be done. |
| NP09 | South Wing Road – refers to current developer? Potential for frontage development only. | Frontal development planned. Recognise need for a LVIA to be done. |
| NP10 | Manor Business Centre – Strong concerns about significant loss of employment use, | NPSG site specific policy statement that site will only |



| Site location number | DM Comment | NPSG response |
|----------------------|---|---|
| | must be justified. CA and LB impact, but potential for improvement to historic environment. Strong headline boundary so lesser wider landscape concerns | be developed if commercial businesses are relocated elsewhere in the village. |
| NP11 | Adj Coal Yard, Dunton Road – projection into countryside, not linear, concerns about landscape impact. However, strong hedge line so potential for further consideration. | Noted |
| NP12 | Griffin Field – Can't be affordable units as below threshold, unless considered cumulative. Need to investigate planning history. Why was this site not originally developed – open space or amenity land? Potential for development subject to detail and further work. | Noted |
| NP13 | Potash House Barns – Poor location plan so difficult to establish site. Need to check planning history. Likely potential for re-use of existing buildings subject to further consideration (RA11). Retention of agricultural barns? Conflict with residential use. Locationally not sustainable and way out of built up part of settlement. | Consideration to drop this site – decision taken October 2018 |

Bucks County Council Highways comments

Highways and transport: the majority of proposed sites had no major issues raised by BCC highways and transport with the exception of

Site NP04 Bowls Farm – concern about visibility splay

Site NP13 Potash – concern raised about visibility splay and proximity to a junction.

As a result of combined AVDC feedback, site NP13 was dropped from the Neighbourhood Plan, a decision initiated at the NPSG meeting on 22nd October 2018 and ratified by SPC at the council meeting on 3 June 2019.

A document detailing the changes made to the wording in the draft Plan is embedded here. Decisions were documented in the NPSG meeting on 16 January 2019 and are recorded in the meeting minutes, also embedded here.



Rewording of
relevant sections in d



NPSG meeting
minutes

Appendix 8 summarises the feedback from AVDC departments.

7.0 STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Aylesbury Vale District Council determined that the Stewkley Neighbourhood Development Plan had some potential to have significant environmental effects beyond those expected by 'strategic' district-wide policies of the Local Plan, and requested a Strategic Environmental Assessment be prepared. In December 2017, the draft SEA scoping report was submitted to three statutory consultees for review and comment: Historic England (English Heritage), Natural England and the Environmental Agency.

As a result of feedback from these consultees, the following views were incorporated into the SEA.

The Environmental Agency (EA) identified small areas of modelled fluvial flood risk associated with the head of the Hardwick Brook to the west and south-west of Stewkley and various small watercourses in the Neighbourhood Plan area designation, although none of these are classified as main rivers. The EA recommended an assessment of the potential impacts of the neighbourhood plan on these.

There is one industrial installation with an Environmental Permit within the Neighbourhood Plan area and two just outside the plan area.

There are two Environmental Permits for waste operations within the plan area. New development within 250 metres (m) of an existing waste facility, or within 400m of an existing intensive poultry farm, could result in the community at the proposed development being exposed to odour, noise, dust and pest impacts.

Natural England highlighted the need for policies around connected green space and suggested that a measure of biodiversity net loss or gain should be provided for the plan. Also, that development sites should be assessed for 'Best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land' (Grades 1-3a).

Historic England highlighted that new developments could contribute to issues already highlighted in the Stewkley Conservation Area Appraisal and that potential cumulative impact should be considered. Also, that sites may be considered that could affect heritage assets within the plan area, or in its vicinity either directly or indirectly by affecting its setting or resulting in indirect effects such as increased traffic.

8.0 REGULATION 14 PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION

The Regulation 14 pre-submission Plan and supporting documents are available to view online at <https://stewkley.org.uk/np-pre-submission>.



The pre-submission documents were submitted electronically to all required and statutory consultees listed in Appendix 9 in time for the consultation period which started on 17 June 2019 and continued until 28 July 2019.

The parish council website had a Neighbourhood Plan consultation page where a visitor could review the Plan and supporting documents, and submit comments electronically.

Paper copies of the Plan and supporting documents were available to view in the Stewkley village hall billiard room on eight days throughout the consultation period.

The times and dates of consultation were publicised in the Stewkley magazine, the Grapevine for both months. A banner, giving the days and times, was placed outside the village hall throughout the whole consultation period and the parish council Facebook page was updated on every consultation day and shared with the Stewkley village Facebook page.

| JUNE | | | JULY | | |
|---------|----|----------------|---------|----|----------------|
| Tuesday | 18 | 10am – 1pm | Tuesday | 2 | 10am – 1pm |
| | 25 | 10am – 1pm | | 9 | 10am – 1pm |
| | | | | 16 | 10am – 1pm |
| Friday | 21 | 6.30pm -9.30pm | Friday | 19 | 6.30pm -9.30pm |
| | 28 | 6.30pm -9.30pm | | | |

Dates and times of public consultation where paper copies were available to view.

Thirty-five parishioners attended one of the eight consultation days. Comments forms were available, and these added to those comments received on line via the Parish Council webpage. The format of the comments (paper or electronic) was the same.

Twenty four paper forms were received, some containing multiple comments and 15 website visitors left comments. Appendix 9 records those of the statutory consultees who replied with comments.

In total, 127 comments were returned. All comments were transcribed onto a spreadsheet and double checked for completeness and accuracy. Comments were then considered by the



relevant working group chair and where appropriate the Steering Group and a response recorded by each one.

The majority of comments received resulted in a change to the Neighbourhood Plan. A number of comments were relevant to the Plan however no change was required. Several comments were not directly relevant to the Neighbourhood Plan but have been noted by the Parish Council.

The table below summarises these categories of response by section of the Regulation 14 draft Plan.

| Section of the Plan | Total number of comments | Plan revised to address comment | Comment noted: no change required | Comment not relevant to Plan – noted by Parish Council. |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| General | 10 | 1 | 9 | ---- |
| Introduction | 12 | 8 | 3 | 1 |
| Conservation and Heritage | 11 | 6 | 4 | 1 |
| Housing | 40 | 27 | 13 | ---- |
| Roads and Infrastructure | 22 | 7 | 7 | 8 |
| Amenities | 3 | 3 | ---- | ---- |
| Natural environment | 18 | 12 | 2 | 4 |
| Education | 6 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Employment | 4 | 2 | 2 | ---- |
| Delivering the Plan | 1 | 1 | ---- | ---- |
| TOTALS | 127 | 71 | 41 | 15 |



Table summarising the number of comments received for each section of the Regulation 14 pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan and the category of response by the Parish Council.

The spreadsheet and responses to each comment is attached in Appendix 10.

V THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP

2016 Composition of the NPSG

| Name (role) | Experience | Dates |
|--------------------------|---|-------------|
| Neil Dickens (Chair) | Retired Police Deputy Assistant Commissioner | 2016 - |
| Beth Stedman (Secretary) | Personal assistant | 2016 – 2017 |
| Janette Eustace | Clerk to the PC and financial controller | 2016 - |
| David Lett | Youth Club lead and social entrepreneur | 2016-2017 |
| Diana Fawcett | Project management local council | 2016-2017 |
| Lois Allard | Landscape architect | 2016-2017 |
| Andy Chappell | Long history of family in the village, local farmer | 2016-2017 |
| Steve Nicholl | Retired Air Vice-Marshal | 2016 - |
| Neil Shefferd | Journalist | 2016-2017 |
| Jenny Wodey | SPC chair and retired public servant | 2016 - |
| Andrew Pryke | Councillor and architect | 2016 - |
| Deborah Vogwell | Villager | 2016-2017 |

2017 Composition of the NPSG

| Name (role) | Experience | Dates |
|---------------------------|---|-------------|
| Neil Dickens (Chair) | Retired Police Deputy Assistant Commissioner | 2016 - |
| Steve Nicholl (Secretary) | Retired Air Vice-Marshal | 2016 - |
| Janette Eustace | Performance analyst, ex- local government officer | 2016 - |
| Jenny Wodey | SPC Chair and retired public servant | 2016 - |
| Andrew Pryke | Councillor and architect | 2016 - |
| Gill Morgan | Councillor, working in healthcare industry | 2017 - |
| Paul Smith | Councillor and retired public servant | |
| Laraine Chappell | Long history of family in village | 2017 - |
| Emma Galvin | Journalist | 2017 - 2018 |
| Margaret Burgess | Councillor and retired company accountant | 2017 - |

2018 and 2019 Composition of the NPSG

| Name (role) | Experience | Dates |
|---------------------------|---|------------|
| Neil Dickens (Chair) | Retired Police Deputy Assistant Commissioner | 2016 - |
| Steve Nicholl (Secretary) | Retired Air Vice-Marshal | 2016 - |
| Janette Eustace | Performance analyst, ex- local government officer | 2016 - |
| Jenny Wodey | Councillor and retired public servant | 2016 -2019 |
| Andrew Pryke | Councillor and architect | 2016 - |
| Gill Morgan | Councillor, working in healthcare industry | 2017 - |



| | | |
|------------------|--|------------|
| Paul Smith | Councillor and retired public servant | 2017 - |
| Laraine Chappell | Long history of family in village | 2017 -2019 |
| Margaret Burgess | Councillor and retired company accountant | 2017 -2019 |
| Keith Higgins | SPC Chair retired from <i>international corporate industry</i> . | 2018 - |

2020 Composition of the NPSG

| Name (role) | Experience | Dates |
|---------------------------|--|-------------|
| Neil Dickens (Chair) | Retired Police Deputy Assistant Commissioner | 2016 - 2020 |
| Steve Nicholl (Secretary) | Retired Air Vice-Marshal | 2016 - 2020 |
| Janette Eustace | Performance analyst, ex- local government officer | 2016 - 2020 |
| Andrew Pryke | Councillor and architect | 2016 - 2020 |
| Gill Morgan | Councillor, working in healthcare industry | 2017 - 2020 |
| Paul Smith | Councillor and retired public servant | 2017 - 2020 |
| Keith Higgins | SPC Chair retired from <i>international corporate industry</i> . | 2018 - 2020 |

VI APPENDICES

- 1) The questionnaire
- 2) Open Meeting: 16 May 2016 collated comments
- 3) Open Meeting: 11 October 2016 comments
- 4) FAQs developed in response to E-mails received on stewkleynp@gmail.com
- 5) Open Meeting: 11 March 2017 collated comments
- 6) Sites decision making table
- 7) Open Meeting: 15 July 2017 collated comments
- 8) Responses from AVDC departments.
- 9) Statutory consultees.
- 10) Spreadsheet of comments and responses to Regulation 14 consultation



APPENDIX 1 THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Please call 01525 240362 if you would like a large print version

Dear Householder and Stewkley Parish Resident

As you may have heard, Stewkley Parish Council (SPC) has started the process of developing a Neighbourhood Plan (NP). The Plan gives us all an opportunity to have a say in the future growth and development of YOUR village / parish. To begin this process we need to gather up-to-date information about our village / parish and that is the purpose of this questionnaire.

Please get involved and complete your questionnaire. It should take about 15 minutes of your time and the analysis of the data will be made available for your review and feedback. The distribution and collection of the questionnaires is being managed by volunteers.

- Please complete this questionnaire. Your feedback is very important to the success of this part of the NP.
- You are under no obligation to participate.
- Please return your questionnaire (completed or blank) to your volunteer by the date indicated.
- Please contact your volunteer if you have any questions or concerns.

Your questionnaire has been delivered by:

Contact number / other details:

Your volunteer will collect your questionnaire on _____ at _____

If you are not in, please leave it in a visible place to be collected. If this is not convenient, your volunteer will return on another day. You can also contact your volunteer to arrange a different pick up time. If you choose not to complete the questionnaire, please leave it out to be collected.

The questionnaire is also available on the Parish Council website
(<http://stewkleypc.webs.com>)

Thank you very much for your support by completing this questionnaire. The more responses we get, the more accurate we can be with our planning.

How to complete the questionnaire:

In all cases, where we refer to 'you' we mean '**you and all members of your Household**'

"Stewkley" when used in these questions means **Stewkley village and parish**

Please complete as many questions as possible, but skip those that don't apply to you.

If you are not sure about a question, ask your volunteer.

For multiple choice questions, please circle your answer(s).

For questions asking about frequency of use; please choose the answer that is the closest match.



Stewkley Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement

Please let us know what part of the Stewkley Parish you live in?

Road address:

Post Code

GENERAL

Let us know a bit about you and your household

Q1 Type of property

Number of bedrooms

Other: Please describe

Bungalow: detached / semi / terraced

House: detached / semi / terraced
(House includes barn conversion and farm cottage)

Flat / apartment

Working farmhouse

Specially adapted (disabled) Y / N

Q2 Is your home

Owner / occupier

Rented

Social housing

Q3 How many years have you lived in:

This property?

Stewkley Parish?

Q4 Do you think you (the householder) will stay in Stewkley?

Y / N /

Q5 How many cars / vans etc. do you have?

Number regularly parked on the road

Q6 Ages of each person in your household. Please enter the total number for each age range in the box. If there are none, leave that box empty.

0 - 5

6 - 11

12 - 18

19 - 25

26 - 35

36 - 45

46 - 55

56 - 65

66 - 80

over 80

SCHOOLING

Q7 Name the local school(s) / college(s) that are attended on a daily basis
Please write in all that apply from nursery to universities.



Stewkley Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement

BUSINESS / EMPLOYMENT

Q8 Your household occupations. (please circle all those applicable)

| | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| Employed full time | Employed part time | Self-employed | Home worker |
| Retired | Volunteer worker | Student / full time education | |

Q9 Is a business run from your home?

Q10 For each working person in your home, how many: Work from home? (min 1 day per week)
Employed by a business in Stewkley, or work in Stewkley?

Q11 How many commute outside of Stewkley?

Q12 How do they travel to work? (please circle all that apply) Train / Car / motorcycle / bicycle / Coach or Bus

Q13 Would the availability of superfast broadband change your responses to Questions 9 to 11?

Q14 Would your household welcome "small" businesses setting-up to provide employment in Stewkley?

ENVIRONMENTAL

Q15 For each area in the table below please indicate how many times per month you (and members of your household) make use of it. For example if you walk a dog every day (30), jog 3 times a week (12) and use the children's play area most weekends (4); the number would be 46

Q16 For each area in the table below, please indicate on a 5 point scale, how much the household values or appreciates the areas listed? (scale: 1 to 5 where 1 = not at all and 5 = highly valued)

| Environmental / leisure area | Frequency of use (Please give a number) | Value / Appreciate (1= not at all 5 = highly valued) |
|--|--|---|
| Recreation Ground | | |
| Sports fields / pitches including tennis courts. | | |
| Stewkley wildlife areas / nature reserve | | |
| Stewkley spinney (airport) | | |
| Local footpaths /bridleways | | |

SAFETY How safe does your household feel in Stewkley?

Q17 Choose from: 1 = very unsafe; 2=fairly unsafe; 3= neither safe nor unsafe; 4-fairly safe; 5=very safe.

By Day

By Night 26 of 50



Stewkley Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Q18 Do any of your household currently use local public bus transport to or from Stewkley? If so, please write in any journeys you make and frequency per month.

| | | | | | |
|-------|-----------|-------|-----------|-------|-----------|
| Where | Frequency | Where | Frequency | Where | Frequency |
|-------|-----------|-------|-----------|-------|-----------|

Q19 If "regular" local community transport, (eg, a community minibus shared with other nearby villages), with suitable timetables were available for local people to make local trips (under approx. 10 miles), list destinations and number of journeys per month that your household would make.

| | | | | | |
|-------|-----------|-------|-----------|-------|-----------|
| Where | Frequency | Where | Frequency | Where | Frequency |
| Where | Frequency | Where | Frequency | Where | Frequency |

STEWKLEY FACILITIES

Q20 For each Stewkley facilities in the table below, please indicate your household's frequency of the use. Please enter a "X"

| Stewkley facility used | Daily | Weekly | Fortnightly | Monthly | Occasionally | Never |
|---|-------|--------|-------------|---------|--------------|-------|
| Village shop | | | | | | |
| Stewkley pubs or Pavilion bar | | | | | | |
| Stewkley pubs or fish & chip van to eat / or takeaway | | | | | | |

Q21 For each of the following facilities in Stewkley, please indicate your household's frequency of use ? Please enter a "X"

| Stewkley facility used | Regularly | Occasionally | Rarely | Never |
|---------------------------|-----------|--------------|--------|-------|
| Village Hall | | | | |
| St Michaels school | | | | |
| Church / Methodist Chapel | | | | |
| Rec Pavilion | | | | |

Q22 Does your household use the Doctor Surgery held in the Recreation Pavilion?

Q23 Where is your household's main Doctor's surgery?

Q24 Do your household use the mobile library? Please enter an "X"

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--|---------|--|--------------|--|-------|--|
| Weekly | | Monthly | | Occasionally | | Never | |
|--------|--|---------|--|--------------|--|-------|--|



Stewkley Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement

Q25 Do your household use an alternative library / libraries? (please state where)

YOUNG PEOPLE Q26 and Q27 for Young People ONLY (up to 25 years old)

Q26 Which of the following are the young people in the household involved in: (please circle all that apply)

Youth Club / Beavers / Cubs / Scouts / Brownies / Girl Guides / Explorers / Young Farmers /

Junior sports (based on the recreation ground)

Q27 What amenities do your young people use outside of Stewkley? Please describe and give locations. (eg netball in Leighton Buzzard)

| Activity | Location | Activity | Location |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

Q28 If Stewkley is required to build 100 new houses in the next 20 years, please indicate how many of each type of housing you think Stewkley needs? (Please ensure your total adds up to 100)

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------|--|-------------------------|--|
| Executive | | 3 / 4 bed detached | | 3/4 bed semi / terraced | |
| Bungalow | | "Starter" | | Retirement | |
| Flat / apartment | | | | | |
| None | | | | | |

HOUSING – YOUR HOUSEHOLD'S FUTURE NEEDS (next 5 - 10 -20 years)

Q29 List what housing needs your household anticipates requiring and an approximate timing (write '5' if within 5 years '10' if within 10 years and '20' if within 20 years). E.G. starter home within 5 years; 3 / 4 bed within 10 years.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|-------|------------------|-------|-------------------------|-------|
| Exec. | Years | 3/4 bed detached | Years | 3/4 bed semi / terraced | Years |
| Bungalow | Years | "Starter" | Years | Retirement | Years |
| Flat / apartment | Years | None | | | |

Q30 Would your household support new building beyond the existing building line (ie into designated garden / open countryside) to provide for the future Stewkley housing needs?

Y / N

INFORMATION ACCESS



Stewkley Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement

Q31 Thinking about how you find out information, where does your household find out about what is happening in Stewkley?

| Sources of information | Do you use (Please enter a "X") | For those that you use: rank in order of importance (1 meaning most important) |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| On-line Stewkley Parish website | | |
| Parish Council noticeboards | | |
| Grapevine | | |
| Stewkley connections / friends etc | | |
| Local paper diaries | | |
| Other (list): | | |

Q32 How important does your household think the Neighbourhood Plan is?

Scale of 1-5. 1= not very important and 5 = extremely important

AND FINALLY

Q33 Please list your household's top 3 reasons for living and staying in Stewkley: Examples are:

Village schooling / catchment area for schooling / commuting / facilities / countryside / history / community / picturesque / geographical location / employment / family connections / house prices / peaceful

Q34 Is there anything that you would like to tell us that would be useful for the Stewkley Neighbourhood Plan?

Confidentiality statement:

All individual responses will be treated in the strictest confidence and will only be used for the purpose of the Neighbourhood Plan.

All Volunteers have signed a confidentiality agreement confirming that any information collected will not be shared except for the purposes for which it is being collected.

The information you give us, will have no relevance to any other contact or business you may have with the Parish Council or Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group; and will not be linked in any way with you, as an individual.

If you leave your questionnaire out to be collected by your volunteer: PLEASE PLACE IT INSIDE THE PLASTIC BAG PROVIDED.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your information will be extremely valuable to the development of the Stewkley neighbourhood plan.



APPENDIX 2 OPEN MEETING: 16 MAY 2016 COLLATED COMMENTS

(Comments in red font are comments that were left in response to a comment)

Stewkley Business

Current Broadband is too slow and with more development this gets worse. We need Superfast to expand

To encourage more home businesses in Stewkley less traffic, less commuting, more cross-section of the community, more facilities and amenities needed and used.

Business Club – opportunity to network

Sharing facilities for small at home businesses

Public transport to and from the railway stations

Reliable faster Broadband

Use of the church tower for a Broadband mast

Poor mobile phone reception

Transport and Infrastructure

High speed Broadband

War memorial one way system

Firm policing of illegal parking

Something to slow down the traffic before it comes into the village to stop people using it as a rat run

New developments tend to make parking worse due to 2/3 car families and parking on the roads

High speed Broadband

Traffic calming needed at the war memorial

Regular buses to LB train station

Bus to Wing for the doctors and the wider world

Adequate parking provided for new build properties

Link with other villages to offer more public transport

Public transport important to an ageing population

No point having a one way system at the war memorial if cars have to park in the road, cars coming from South End still come face to face

All the roads into Stewkley are a race track, very straight and 60mph – need to slow people at the edges quickly so respect village better

Cycle route to Wing

We need better Broadband access

Upgrade to Broadband for whole village not sections of it

War memorial please separate left side (by houses) for parking only and make it a T-junction instead

Bus to LB to match commuter trains, morning and evening

Fed up of cars driving on the pavement opposite the shop

Run a circular one hour service to LB/MK centre and railway stations via Wing and Stoke Hammond - two minibuses one in each direction 7am – 8pm

War memorial – parking options for residents with no off road parking. Marked spaces? Parking nearby?

You are concerned about sewerage – has Thames Water been consulted about adequacy of pipes?

Need buses to get to doctors in Wing

Safer cycling facilities – lanes/paths

Facilities to slow down traffic in HSN



Speed humps/cushions rather than ramps or narrow give way calming, people just speed up to get through first

Traffic calming/speed bumps on entrance to village (start them off slow!)

Ivy Lane made one way – cars speeding up to rec.

T junction at War Memorial

Transport to Wing would be ideal for the doctors

The only effective means of traffic calming is speed humps. Road narrowing slows the traffic flow but individuals speed up to get through the narrowed area

Need to slow traffic down on all entrances to the village – speed humps seem the best idea for this.

Conservation and Heritage

Need to protect the conservation area from future development e.g. house extensions

No chapter house – enough facilities already in the village

No changes to listed buildings that can be seen from the road

I love Stewkley as it is, progress is a work to cover mistakes that have changed the village as it should really be

The peace and quiet of the countryside is a huge benefit to the village

Upkeep of Dove House

Keep the character that has evolved over centuries – the countryside visible from within the village and enhance the key heritage areas

Control the development with the Conservation Area and its adjoining borders (comment on this)

OK as long as you live in the Conservation Area

Beating the bounds – village clean up

Protect existing views through the village and vistas to open countryside to maintain the rural character of the village

Protect conservation area

Can we find ways to support owners of listed buildings to keep them well maintained – grants?

Don't forget people who live in ugly new houses don't want over development either. My house is ugly but has beautiful views – just as important

Views lost by building across them (comment on this) this is exactly what the Soulbury Road Development would do

Prevent installation of satellite dishes on buildings facing a road inside the Conservation Area

Semi-permanent egg-box pathways for disabled young and old

Trees are important to the look of the village – we should try and put a TPO on all large specimens

Trees need to be managed and not allowed to get overgrown and too large

Please do not build in the churchyard and ruin the church forevermore – the church is our most valuable heritage asset (comment on this) Don't think it will ruin the church is a must for the church to enable it to do more for the village

Historic assets and important buildings not to be damaged by inappropriate buildings or alterations

The countryside is as important as the buildings here. Protect it from development

I am astounded that erecting a building close to our most precious heritage asset is even being considered. St Michael's church should be left in its current setting

Maintain present density and character of built environment

Young People

I like the Rec – like the equipment

The bad wi-fi signal coverage

I don't like the farm smells by the school



I would like some gym/exercise equipment at the Rec
I would like to start a unicorn riding club
Dance clubs
Start a film club for kids – PG, U, 12
Art shows and art studio or drawing technique clubs
More buses
Music studio/club
Another shop down the south end of the village
Sports equipment at the Rec
Bad parking
Performing arts area
I like the village shop, the park and the neighbourhood
The village shop
I like the ponds and the park and I would like more clubs, flowers and plants and most things to be not made of wood
I like the shop
I have got some family in the village because it is a nice place to live
I like the village shop, the rec and the footpaths

Amenities

More people to use the pub
Protection of assets
Wheelchair/buggy (near) all weather access to childrens' play area in rec (from pavilion)
Us the Carpenters Arms for doctors surgery
We need a village 'centre', a shop or two, perhaps doctors. Take a look at Newton Longville a shop including post office, take away, plenty of parking. Located near houses with garages and drivers, so no invasion of parking space
Keep using the library van – use it or lose it
High speed Broadband
The library would be better if the council were to improve the wi-fi so the driver could order books on line
With the proposed growth of the - we have no doctors surgery – the Ashcroft in Wing has no idea how it will cope with the influx
The doctors surgery problem will be made worse by developments in Wing and Soulbury
Encourage pub owners to invest in The Swan and turn the Carps in to 100% restaurant
A doctors surgery brought back into the village
Area within new development for larger retail area (comment on this) do you want Stewkley to become exactly like MK?
Need to get the churches chapter house completed soon to ensure it can reach out more into the Community

Schooling

Opening up footpath access to the school to keep the Chapel Square safer and quieter. Easier access for parents and children
Match pre and post school care offered by some other providers 7.30 – 6.30pm It would enable all families where both parents have flexibility with school
All weather multi sports pitch at the school with lights
It would be interesting to know what percentage of the schools pupils actually live in the parish of



Stewkley

Check how many school pupils come from away, how many from MK. Keep the school for our own children

Childrens number and housing irrelevant since school children now come from far and wide

Fund raising/awareness for school and other groups

How will the school cope with the proposed influx of children as a result of more housing?

Wider use of school facilities and school use of village spaces

If there is an increase in numbers of children from new housing can pre-school and school provide places?

St Michaels and Cygnets how will they cope with a large influx of more children?

Stewkley Cygnets pre-school is almost at capacity now with 2-5 year olds

What plans are in place for extending school facilities?

Is there someone from Cygnets/St Michaels on the committee?

Increase schooling capacity

The school is great as a small village school. We don't want it to grow too big and impersonal

Elderly and Disabled

We need a neighbour scheme or friends that can visit the elderly, single or vulnerable people for a chat, help or cup of tea

Outings – booking/information on a website

Friend and neighbour scheme to check on single people

Encourage local residents who run businesses or have interesting jobs/hobbies to give presentations or have discussions to retired or elderly groups

Church – wheelchair access (comment on this) scheme is in planning stage

Check/improve camber on paths for mobility scooters/wheelchair stability

Recreational Facilities

Play equipment for older children (comment on this) I agree

Adult gym

A footpath around the edge of the rec incorporating a cycle path would make it safer for all going and returning from school (comment on this) Agree good idea

All weather cycling/running track around rec circumference

3G floodlight football pitch

Adult outdoor gym equipment near childrens' play equipment in rec (comment on this) I agree and yes please

Cycle routes

Encouragement of using public facilities for group exercise

Art Club

Cycle/skateboard facility at the rec

All weather multi sports pitch with floodlights for netball, hockey, tennis, football (5 aside), badminton

Cycle path around rec

Adult netball court – at school or rec

All weather (3G) training pitch for football especially some on football needs floodlights

Outdoor gym in rec, all could benefit, keen young things and older residents

Art/crafts/old skill sessions



| The many comments for Planning, Landscape, Housing and Environment have been grouped by theme. | |
|---|---|
| Comment | Themes |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certainly no to Soulbury Road development • No to Soulbury Road massive development. Too big and not for our benefit just line the pockets of developers and destroy our beautiful village and countryside • No to the Soulbury road development too many in one hit and will be detrimental to all village facilities. • The Soulbury Road site is very large, can the roads, school, doctors cope with this enormous influx? • No big developments built quickly these will not provide for the village needs only bring in new people all at once and there are insufficient facilities • No we should not build on agricultural land i.e. Soulbury Road • 5 to 6 houses per year sounds more sustainable than a one off development of 80 • Smaller developments fit better into the village environment – social cohesion is crucial for good village life – one huge development will not help integration within the community • It may be a good idea to put 80 houses in the Soulbury Road but not all in one hit, the village can't currently sustain that many houses/people with the amenities we have • Might be easier and less disruptive to build all necessary new housing on one site | <p>Site 15 Soulbury Road</p> <p>Large developments not supported</p> <p>Negative impact on village infrastructure and village community</p> <p>Phasing needed to mitigate impact on amenities</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes to the dwellings at 66 HSN • 66 HSN is on a bend, but if enough off road parking is provided it should be considered • I have objected to the application on 66 HSN as on a dangerous bend and will encroach on to farmland • Access to Cricketers Farm is dangerous | <p>Site 12 66 HSN (Cricketers Fm)</p> <p>Incursion into countryside</p> <p>Access and parking</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes to Sycamore close development • Maintain our rural environment no development on prime agricultural land e.g. Sycamore Close • Stewkley's linear plan must be maintained and every effort made to preserve quietness by not directing traffic to new sites on lanes past retirement homes such as Sycamore Close | <p>Proposed development land that became Sites 37 to 39</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smaller tactical developments that can integrate better staged so that develop volume over time • Sensitive infilling. • Ideally small developments • Possibly build a few houses adjacent to roads already part of the village, but not too many or into all our countryside | <p>Small developments – better integration</p> <p>Infill acceptable</p> <p>Benefit for village amenities</p> |



Stewkley Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement

| | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school would benefit from more houses | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscaped gateways to the village may encourage drivers to slow down Landscape/gateways is a good idea An entrance to the village may slow traffic Make a definite start to the village to slow traffic Something saying 'entering the village of Stewkley' Make Stewkley a 'gated' village and charge a toll | Village entry better defined |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Junction between HSS and Dunton road needs to be a roundabout as it is dangerous (not a node) War memorial may be a node but it is a dangerous junction not improved by the corner of HSS leading into it Identifying a village central area might help stop people thinking of one long road and reduce speed, but should improve the village feel. Whether we could put up village heart boards – I don't know Dunton Road needs a speed limit or lorry ban | <p>General comments about the roads within Stewkley</p> <p>Speed and dangerous junctions</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mix bungalows (elderly/disabled) in amongst family and exec housing Elderly residents wishing to downsize do not necessarily want to live in a bungalow or flat Affordable, perhaps shared ownership for start ups spread out through the village enabling elderly and younger to mix <i>Handwriting difficult to read</i> Need to build more houses as put the survey results | Stewkley requirements for new housing |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the countryside is covered with housing Stewkley will not be a village but a town with no facilities I chose to live in a village to live near nature Leave the countryside for our children and us to enjoy No we should not build beyond existing road and no we should not build on agricultural land I agree with the comment about maintaining the linear plan to the village and no further building on agricultural land – preserve our lovely green landscape Many of these points-views over countryside, etc. should have been taken into account 50 years ago before any infill housing was allowed. It's a case of locking the stable door after the horse has bolted | <p>Protect the countryside</p> <p>Avoid over development - urbanisation</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes to HSS by Carps development Carpenters Arms development could be a doctors, school, post office or half a pub | <i>Not a designated site – pub was closed at time of questionnaire</i> |



APPENDIX 3 OPEN MEETING: 11 OCTOBER 2016 COMMENTS

Verbal questions/comments

- How can Bowles Farm be knocked down? – it is in the conservation area and would be protected. Older buildings don't have foundations and additional traffic would have a detrimental effect.
- Submitting just 43 dwellings for the VALP is not enough when AVDC is asking for a total of 128. This assumes that Soulbury Road is accepted.
- Why are we submitting sites that have already been rejected by AVDC?
- What is the timetable for the proposed Soulbury Road development?
- It's a 20 year plan, but when would houses be built?
- We would miss out on Section 106 development money if we just have small developments on small sites.
- Would the school be able to cope with the additional children?
- Could the information used to assess the sites be shared?
- Has safety and access been considered in the assessment?
- Affordable houses, land owners want to get the maximum value from their land, where does the subsidy come from?
- Building bungalows gives a smaller return – why would developers want them?
- Has shared ownership been considered?

Written Comments

- Objection to green plan ref 7 – Bowls Farm. Poor visibility entering farm due to curve of road – refer your plans – car driver would have to drive to centre of road to gain visibility.
- Also Bowls Farm and cottages opposite, Plough/Garden/129/131 are in the conservation area. These properties do not have modern foundations. Coach has written off parked car opposite farm (full of school children)
- Good to see housing developments spread evenly across the village and not just one large development. If we need housing build them in the village which will maintain the character of the village.



Stewkley Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement

- Bearing in mind the fact that the requirement is to build in the Parish of Stewkley, why are all these sites in Stewkley itself? The Parish (as far as I know) goes almost to Mursley, Cublington, Soulbury and Littlecote??
- I cannot understand how the triangle (no 8 on the plan) has received your green light – it looks like an island of development in the middle of a field!
- Further discussion requested



APPENDIX 4 FAQs DEVELOPED IN RESPONSE TO EMAILS

| Question asked | Question asked |
|---|---|
| Why do we need a Neighbourhood Plan? | Why is there not more detail about the number and size of properties being considered for each site? |
| What is a 'Made Neighbourhood Plan'? | Why are some sites coloured (red, green and orange) and others are not? |
| Who is the plan for and who is creating it? | Why and how did the NP team 'score' the sites? |
| What is the timescale? | Isn't access from the main roads an issue, in particular during construction, and will severely impact residents near new developments? |
| Has Stewkley Parish Council defined a Code of Conduct for the Neighbourhood Plan team and its Steering Committee? | Will the sewage/drainage systems be able to cope with all the new houses? |
| Why have some landowners been displaying information about their potential developments at NP exhibitions? | I am concerned about the impact on traffic and infrastructure. Will developers contribute towards road infrastructure improvements? |
| How has the consultation process been defined and advertised? | What is the time scale for Soulbury Road development? |
| Why are we sometimes asked for opinions or to vote on different but related topics separately (for example the drafted boundary and site locations). Wouldn't it be more logical to combine them? | Would the school be able to cope with the additional children? |
| How were the potential areas for new homes decided upon? | What evidence is there that one quarter of the new homes built should be adapted for elderly and disabled? |
| How will the housing mix be decided?. | Will every site be required to provide a housing mix that includes 25% housing for the elderly and disabled? |
| Won't infill between individual sites result in an overcrowded look to the village roads? | Is Site 15 (Soulbury Road Development) going to be included in the Neighbourhood Plan? |
| What if I object to a particular site for personal reasons or I am against all development in Stewkley? | Is Site 17 (Field behind Methodist Church) included in the Neighbourhood Plan? |
| Land owners want to get the maximum value from their land, where does the subsidy for affordable homes come from? | Will each site in the NP have to provide a percentage of affordable homes and adapted homes? |
| Will a new build residential development nearby reduce property values in Stewkley? | Why is the Neighbourhood Plan restricting the numbers on each development site to 10 or fewer new homes, a 2014 Ministerial statement has said that developments of 10 or less do not need to provide affordable housing? |
| Is there a risk that the requirement for adapted homes will increase the building costs and make developments unviable? | Will the requirement to comply with the village design guide increase building costs? Why is the Plan stipulating the type of building materials that must be used, and |



Stewkley Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement

| | |
|--|--|
| | what happens if they are not available? |
| Won't landowners and developers want to build profitable homes on their land? Why would they want to build adapted single-storey homes? | How are we supposed to interpret the boundary that is published on the website. It has neither key nor explanation? |
| Will all the adapted single- storey homes be sold at market prices or be available as affordable housing? | What is the time frame for development – everything in the 2016 flier seems to be within the first 5 years? |
| If we try to protect our linear village, we could overcrowd the centre. Isn't it the case that smaller developments could have a greater negative impact than larger developments outside the boundary, as more views could be affected? | Can we appeal against the target of 123 new homes imposed by AVDC? |
| Why would we support ribbon development beyond the 30 mph signs? Why has a ' boundary' been suggested? | Why are sites rejected by AVDC in the HELAA being submitted? |
| How can we propose substantial building in the conservation area? | Would the village miss out on S106 development money if we just had small developments on small sites? |
| How can we protect the rural nature of the area and farm land, minimise environmental impact, protect our green spaces, and maintain the character of the village. | What is the HELAA and where can I find it? |
| Won't new houses increase potential for crime? | Why do the proposed numbers in the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) for adapted housing differ from those published by AVDC in their consultation document (10% of market homes and 15% of affordable homes)? |
| Will we lose our employment area? | Why does the Neighbourhood Plan stipulate parking requirements that are in excess of those required by Bucks County Council and AVDC? |



APPENDIX 5 OPEN MEETING: 11 MARCH 2017 COLLATED COMMENTS

(10 pages)

Stewkley Residents' Feedback to Potential Sites

Site 1

| Comments in support of 'Favourable' and suggested type of development | | Comments in support of 'Unfavourable' | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Terraced, starter homes | 1 | Develop within existing limit/prevent sprawl/ribbon development | 5 |
| Bungalows | 6 | Too far from community assets such as school, Rec, Hall, Churches | 4 |
| Traditional building style/materials | 1 | Increase car journeys | 2 |
| 2-3 Bed | 1 | Ancient fields at entrance to village | 1 |
| 3 Bed family homes | 1 | Protect farm land | 1 |
| Service road, single point of access to Bletchley Road | 1 | Too visible | 1 |
| Extend 30 mph limit | 1 | Does not enhance community | 1 |
| Landscape to protect countryside/views | 1 | Poor access/dangerous spot | 1 |
| Not impact on conservation area | 1 | Already congested road | 1 |
| Little impact on historic centre | 1 | | |
| Starter homes for 1 st time buyers | 1 | | |
| Not opposed to extending village | 1 | | |
| Most people use cars to get to amenities | 1 | | |

Site 2

| Comments in support of 'Favourable' and suggested type of development | | Comments in support of 'Unfavourable' | |
|--|---|---|---|
| Terraced, starter homes | 1 | Develop within existing limit/prevent sprawl/ribbon development | 5 |
| Bungalows | 5 | Too far from community assets such as school, Rec, Hall, Churches | 2 |
| Traditional building style/materials | 1 | Increase car journeys | 1 |
| Family homes | 1 | Too visible | 1 |
| Semi-detached | 2 | Does not enhance community | 1 |
| Sits well with existing cluster of housing | 1 | Removes buffer of trees | 1 |
| Demarcation to entrance of village/ Greater impact when leaving towards open countryside | 1 | Protect farm land | 1 |
| Prefer to extend the village line rather than the linear line | 1 | Protect rural vistas | 1 |
| Not opposed to extending village | 1 | Poor visibility to South | 1 |
| Most people use cars to get to amenities | 1 | Poor access/dangerous spot | 1 |
| | | Already congested road | 1 |

Site 3

| Comments in support of 'Favourable' & suggested type development | | Comments in support of 'Unfavourable' | |
|--|---|---|---|
| Bungalows | 4 | Remote from village | 2 |
| 2-3 Bed starter homes | 1 | Develop within existing limit/prevent sprawl/ribbon development | 7 |
| Service road, single point of access to Bletchley Road | 1 | Too far from community assets such as school, Rec, Hall, Churches | 2 |
| Extend 30 mph limit | 1 | Increase car journeys | 1 |



APPENDIX 6 SITE DECISION MAKING TABLE

| Site No. | Site / colour coded by NPSG | <i>Within settlement boundary</i> | HELAA | AVDC support | Village support (11/3/17 vote results) | Conservation area? | Decision Yes or No | Number of houses | When |
|----------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------|--|--------------------|---------------------------|------------------|-------|
| 1 | Bletchley Rd W | N/A? | | Difficult | Yes | NO | YES | 6 | 10+ |
| 2 | Bletchley Rd W | YES | | Difficult | Yes | NO | YES | 1 | 10+ |
| 3 | Bletchley Rd E | NO | | Difficult | No | NO | YES | | 10+ |
| 7 | Bowls Fm HSN | YES | NO | ? | Yes | YES | YES | 4 | 10-15 |
| 8 | 124 HSN | YES | | Difficult | No | | NO | | |
| 9 | 122 HSN | YES | | Very Difficult | No | | NO | | |
| 10 | Laurel Fm | YES | | Very Difficult | No | | NO | | |
| 12 | 66 HSN / Cricketers Fm | NO? | YES | N/A | Not included in public vote. Outline Planning approved | YES | YES | 14 | 5 |
| 15 | Soulbury Rd | NO | YES | YES Outline planning approved | No | NO | YES | 67 | 5 |



Stewkley Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement

| Site No. | Site / colour coded by NPSG | <i>Within settlement boundary</i> | HELAA | AVDC support | Village support (11/3/17 vote results) | Conservation area? | Decision Yes or No | Number of houses | When |
|----------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------|--|--------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|------|
| 17 | Land behind Chapel | YES | NO | Difficult | No | | NO | | |
| 20 | Wing Rd E | YES | | YES | No | | YES | 8 | 5+ |
| 21 | Wing Rd E | NO | | YES | No | | NO | | |
| 22 | Wing Rd Orchard | YES | NO | YES | Yes | YES | YES | 5 | 5+ |
| 23 | Wing Rd W | YES | | YES | Yes | | YES | 6 | 5+ |
| 28 | Dunton Rd North | NO | | NO | No | | NO | | |
| 29 | Dunton Rd North | YES | | NO | No | | NO | | |
| 30 | South Ln, North side | YES | | NO | Neutral | | NO | | |
| 33 | Manor Park | YES | | Possible | No | YES | YES | 6 | 15+ |
| 37 | Sycamore Fm | YES | NO | NO | No | | NO | | |
| 38 | Sycamore Close | YES | | NO | No | | NO | | |
| 39 | Sycamore Close | YES | | NO | No | | NO | | |
| 44 | Dean Rd | NO | | --- | No | NO | NO | | |



Stewkley Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement

| Site No. | Site / colour coded by NPSG | <i>Within settlement boundary</i> | HELAA | AVDC support | Village support (11/3/17 vote results) | Conservation area? | Decision Yes or No | Number of houses | When |
|--------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------|--|--------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|------|
| 46 | South Ln | NO | | NO | No | NO | NO | | |
| 47 | West of site 23 | YES | | --- | Yes | | YES | 1 | 5+ |
| 49 | Land behind CC | NO | NO | NO | No | | NO | | |
| 50 | Land off Dunton Rd | NO | | --- | No | | NO | | |
| 51 | 10 Haywood Pk | YES | | YES | Yes | YES | YES | 2 | 5+ |
| 52 | Potash Barn | N/A | | --- | Yes | NO | YES | 3 | 5+ |
| 53 | Griffin Field | YES | | YES | Yes | | YES | 2 | 5+ |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | 125 | |



APPENDIX 7 OPEN MEETING: 15 JULY 2017 COLLATED COMMENTS

(9 PAGES)

Stewkely Residents' Feedback to New Development Sites (from 15 July 2017 Exhibition) (updated version 5 August)

Site Comments

Site 1

| Comments in Support of 'Favourable' and suggested type of development | | Comments in support of 'Unfavourable' | |
|---|---|--|---|
| Good site | 1 | Segregated from village (not continuing existing housing line) | 2 |
| | | Too visible | 1 |
| | | Building on Ridge and Furrow (Heritage site) | 2 |
| | | Poor Access/Dangerous traffic spot | 1 |

Site 2

| Comments in Support of 'Favourable' and suggested type of development | | Comments in support of 'Unfavourable' | |
|---|---|--|---|
| Good site | 1 | Segregated from village (not continuing existing housing line) | 2 |
| | | Too visible | 1 |
| | | Building on Ridge and Furrow (Heritage site) | 2 |
| | | Poor Access/Dangerous traffic spot | 1 |



APPENDIX 8 COLLATED FEEDBACK FROM AVDC DEPARTMENTS

NP Support team

21 pages of comments embedded into the document which is inserted on the following page.



AVDC Comments Aug
2018.pdf

Comment 13 also included the following site summary.

NP01 + NP03 are very remote – need landscape and DM's views really but it isn't the sort of site we would usually like to see come forward. It would need to be quite built up already but it appears greenfield, open field.

NP04 – HELAA unsuitable, no planning apps since so still unsuitable no reason to change.

NP07 and 08 – conservation area probably the main issue and to integrate into settlement pattern would think frontage at 3 Wing Road only less than 5. The HELAA basically says this it was unsuitable (STW001 in HELAA) because 5 is the minimum the HELAA can look at so 1,2,3 or 4 might have been ok. Need DM and heritage views. NP07 and 08 look more isolated though than the 3 Wing Road site in the HELAA and also need landscape's opinion. Doubtful we would see these are good sites.

NP09 looks out of keeping with settlement pattern and might have adverse wider landscape/visual impact and might be adverse impact on the conservation area to the north. Need DM, landscape, heritage views but it looks doubtful from plan.

NP10 might be ok but big site in/adjacent conservation area. Some kind of conversion job might be what we would like to see. Not building further towards the countryside though.

NP11 unlikely to be suitable because of settlement pattern, openness rear of Dunton Road and impact on conservation area.

NP12 – was in the HELAA and the problems were access and also impact on listed buildings and conservation area, character of Stewkley. Even if access can be overcome the other issues still remain so difficult. But is only 2 so not out of the question. Have to convince heritage and DM.

NP13 – very remote and impact on traffic and landscape/visual will be important. A conversion for 4 homes - it might be possible but need consultees to look at it – BCC highways, our landscape team and DM.

There is no reason the plan cannot allocate these sites, but that's not to say that they are deliverable or achievable, Strongly recommend discussing these sites directly with other departments before going forward to pre-submission stage.



Comments from other named departments within AVDC

Heritage

It may be worth considering using the terms non designated heritage assets instead of non listed heritage assets.

I don't have any comment in terms of the information required for applications comment, as this is a local requirement and reflected in the NPPF.

You may want to consider the use of community vs public benefit and consider that in the NPPF, there are also other tests to be applied when there is harm.

Development management

NP01 and NP02 North side Bletchley Road – Concerns over these allocations: Questioned why this didn't form part of allocation with NP02. Outside of the built-up part of the settlement and not infill. Likely landscape and countryside edge visual impact. Agricultural farm, potential amenity impact through noise and disturbance etc. Maybe some potential for limited frontage development.

NP03 South side Bletchley Road – As above, in terms of beyond built-up part of the settlement but potential for some limited frontage development.

NP04 Bowls Farm, High Street North (HELAA not suitable) – Showing agricultural buildings kept? Need to clarify extent of site allocation. CA impact? Access close to existing dwellings, impact on amenity. Not linear development.

NP05 Cricketers, High Street North – Outline approved and ADP in so principle accepted, subject to detail.

NP06 Soulbury Road – Outline approved so principle accepted, subject to detail.

NP07 Wing Road – Outside of built up part, not infill. CA impact? Not following field boundaries. Significant landscape impact, very open views, prominent. Potential for very limited frontage impact given development opposite.

NP08 Wing Road – as above

NP09 south Wing Road – refers to current developer? Potential for frontage development only.

NP10 Manor Business Centre – Strong concerns about significant loss of employment use, must be justified. CA and LB impact, but potential for improvement to historic environment. Strong headline boundary so lesser wider landscape concerns.

NP11 – Adj Coal Yard, Dunton Road – projection into countryside, not linear, concerns about landscape impact. However, strong hedge line so potential for further consideration.



NP12 Griffin Field – Can't be affordable units as below threshold, unless considered cumulative. Need to investigate planning history. Why was this site not originally developed – open space or amenity land? Potential for development subject to detail and further work.

NP13 – Potash House Barns – Poor location plan so difficult to establish site. Need to check planning history. Likely potential for re-use of existing buildings subject to further consideration (RA11). Retention of agricultural barns? Conflict with residential use. Locationally not sustainable and way out of built up part of settlement.

Overall each of the policies will require further work and reference given to the impact on the historic environment, agri land grading, landscape, residential amenities as appropriate. Have you sought input from historic and landscape colleagues? We did struggle with the maps provided in trying to locate the extent of the sites and also we didn't have a copy of the settlement boundary plan which would have assisted, however, I hope the above comments are of assistance as a starting point. We ran out of time in our meeting to go into detail in respect of the wording of the policies and these did not appear very consistent.

BCC Highways

NP01: The existing speed limit would need relocating, however subject to suitable access arrangements, footway connections and detailed design, the principle of the development is acceptable in this location.

NP02: The existing speed limit would need relocating, however subject to suitable access arrangements, footway connections and detailed design, the principle of the development is acceptable in this location.

NP03: The existing speed limit would need relocating, however subject to suitable access arrangements, footway connections and detailed design, the principle of the development is acceptable in this location.

NP04: The visibility from the existing access point appears to be restricted in both directions, especially to the east. This would need to be investigated before any scheme were to come forward. As discussed on site, the existing hedge could potentially be trimmed back however I am unsure as to whether this would provide the required level of visibility.

NP07: Subject to suitable access arrangements, footway connections and detailed design, the principle of the development is acceptable in this location.

NP08: Subject to suitable access arrangements, footway connections and detailed design, the principle of the development is acceptable in this location.

NP09: Subject to suitable access arrangements, footway connections and detailed design, the principle of the development is acceptable in this location.

NP11: Subject to suitable access arrangements, footway connections and detailed design, the principle of the development is acceptable in this location.

NP13: The existing grassed access suffers from restricted visibility, even with the removal of the existing outhouses I still have concerns over the level of visibility achievable to the south.



This access is also opposite the B4032/Main Road junction, and there are concerns over confusion and conflicting between opposing vehicles. I would advise any future schemes to investigate the possibility of accessing the development via the existing access to Potash House, this would remove the concerns over conflicting vehicle movements, however the visibility to the north may be restricted. The site is also remote from the main settlement of Stewkley and does not benefit from any pedestrian or public transport links, work would need to be undertaken to demonstrate that the site is sustainable from a highway perspective.

In summary, the majority of the locations put forward would be acceptable from a highway perspective, however further work needs to be done to demonstrate that suitable access could be achieved to NP04. With regards to NP13, it is a very difficult site and it may prove difficult to overcome the highways concerns mentioned above.

Where sites are required to provide access for adjacent plots I would advise that this is written into the plan to ensure that all parties are aware of the requirements, and to ensure that no parties are held to ransom over access.

I hope this is helpful, if you have any further queries please contact me and I will try to assist.



APPENDIX 9 STATUTORY CONSULTEES

| Consultee | Response received |
|--|-------------------|
| AVDC | YES |
| Strategic Planning BCC | YES |
| Drayton Parslow PC | NO |
| Mursley PC | NO |
| Wing PC | YES |
| Soulbury PC | NO |
| Newton Longville PC | NO |
| Creslow PC | NO |
| Dunton PC | NO |
| The homes and communities agency | NO |
| Natural England | YES |
| The Environment Agency | YES |
| English Heritage | NO |
| Network Rail | NO |
| Highways Agency | NO |
| East Midlands Electricity Board | NO |
| Mobile phone operators: Vodafone, EE, Three, | NO |
| BC Electrical | NO |
| AMEC National Grid | YES |
| Mono consultants | NO |
| Buckinghamshire NHS trust | NO |
| East Midlands Electricity Board | NO |
| British Gas (southern) | NO |
| Thames water | YES |
| Anglian water | YES |
| SE Midlands Local Enterprise | NO |
| Bucks Thames valley Local Enterprise | NO |
| Buckinghamshire Business First | NO |
| St Michaels school Stewkley | NO |
| Cottesloe school Wing | NO |
| Protection of Rural England | NO |
| British Telecom | NO |
| Gigaclear | NO |
| Stewkley Recreation Ground Association | NO |
| Stewkley village hall committee | NO |
| Stewkley Anglican church | NO |
| Stewkley Methodist chapel | NO |
| Stewkley Cygnets | NO |
| Royal British Legion (Stewkley branch) | NO |
| Women's Institute | NO |
| Stewkley Scouts | NO |
| Stewkley Brownies | NO |



APPENDIX 10 SPREADSHEET OF COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION

Comments were received by three different routes:

1. Paper comments completed in the village hall during the eight periods when the Plan and supporting documents were available to view.
2. Electronic comments via the Parish Council website
3. Email to stewkleynp@gmail.com

All comments received during the Regulation 14 consultations were transcribed into a spreadsheet, and every comment was considered and a response given.

In total 127 comments were recorded.

Seventy-one comments were addressed in the revision of the Plan.

Forty-one comments were noted and did not require a change to the Plan

Fifteen comments were not pertinent to the Plan, however were relevant to the parish and were noted by the Parish Council.

The spreadsheet with all comments and responses is embedded here. In this version, for data protection reasons, comments made by an individual are identified as an individual and not by name.

Source of
comment

Comment