

Consultation Statement for Stoke Hammond Reg 15 Submission

This consultation statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 (as amended) in respect of Stoke Hammond Parish Councils Neighbourhood Plan 2023 – 2040. The legal basis of this Statement is provided by Section 15 (2) of Part 5 of the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations, which requires that a consultation statement should:

- Contain details of the persons and bodies that were consulted about the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.
- Explain how they were consulted.
- Summarise the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted.
- Describe how those issues and concerns have been considered and where relevant addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

Neighbourhood Plan Area Designation

Stoke Hammond Parish Council (SHPC) has prepared a Neighbourhood Plan (SHNP) for the area designated by the local planning authority, Buckinghamshire Council.

Timeline of events

The timeline of events below demonstrates the evolution of SHNP as well as ongoing communications and feedback undertaken through regular updates via Stoke Hammond News (SHNews) on a quarterly basis, which is hand delivered to every household in the village as well as a weekend Exhibition in March 2023, 4 Walk in a face-to-face meeting inviting members of the public in February 2024. The Steering Group have also given face to face updates to Parish Councillors at monthly meetings which have been minuted, all minutes are published on the Parish Councils website along with the Steering Group Minutes.

2021

- The Parish Council decided to begin the process of developing a Neighbourhood Plan in June 2021. Councillor Willingale was nominated PC lead and he reached out to O'NeillHomer. They produced a proposal explaining the stages of the NP process and quoting for their support through the process.
- In August an extraordinary Council Meeting formally approved the project, appointing O'NeillHomer as consultants and applying for the government grant.
- In September the application was submitted for the grant and to Bucks council for approval of the NP designated area.
- In September the Parish council had a stall at the Stoke Hammond Village Fete, promoting for the first time, the Neighbourhood Plan, and the associated Community Strategy for utilising available Parish Council land and S106 financial resources to improve sports and recreational facilities. A statement of support providing email contacts was signed by 70 parishioners.

- In October, Bucks Council approved the Parish Council area as designated for the Neighbourhood plan and the government grant for 2021.22 was awarded.
- In November the Scoping questionnaire was produced by Councillor Willingale with the support of O'NeillHomer and it was signed off for use by the Council.
- In November a meeting was held with all the key Community Groups in the parish to explain the NP Process and the S106 availability, at which they gave their support to the initiative.
- The Scoping questionnaire was completed over a 5-week period during December and January.

2022

- In January 90 completed surveys, 26 hard copy and 64 online were available for analysis.
- In February the output was shared with O'NeillHomer who produced a scoping report detailing their proposed policy areas. An analysis of both written and numeric feedback was included in a report for Parishioners on the SHPC Website. A copy was included in the Pre-submission Plan at Annex D and is included with this document at Annex A.

Steering Group

- A steering group was created with 13 members of which 5 were on the Parish Council and 8 were parishioners.
- The Chairman was originally Councillor Willingale but changed to Councillor Newing when the formers personal circumstances changed.
- The first Steering Group confirmed the following Policy areas to be developed.
 - Settlement Boundareies
 - Design/Guidance and Coding
 - Local Heritage Assets
 - Green Infrastructure
 - Sustainable Travel
 - Housing Mix
 - Passivhaus Standard
 - Traffic Management
 - Site Allocations – Whilst the Aylesbury Vale Local Plan had no additional housing requirements for Stoke Hammond Parish, it was considered inevitable that the developing Bucks Local Plan would include a contribution from the Parish.
- Two working groups were set up the Green team focusing on Design guidance, Local Heritage assets, Green Infrastructure and sustainable travel. The red team focused on Housing Mix, Traffic Management and Site Allocations
- For the spring period the following activities were carried out as part of the policy development action plan
 - Village walkabout in May – The Green team with O'NeillHomer support focused on establishing character areas within the village, the conservation area and local historic sites.
 - Mapping across the Parish Green Infrastructure and Sustainable travel routes.
 - Traffic Management – a detailed survey of traffic particularly with respect to the Village and Newton Leys development.

- Site Allocations – A call for sites process was commenced. This process was outlined in the Pre-Submission plan at Annex F and is include with this document at Annex B.

2023

- The first draft of the SHNP was shared with Parishioners at a weekend Exhibition in March where visitors were asked to demonstrate their support and to prioritise the 8 remaining sites from the call for site process. The event was attended by 107 parishioners with a 95% satisfaction score. They were also asked to prioritise the use of available Parish Council land between
 - A new Village / Sports Hall
 - More sports pitches
 - Left as green space.
- 50% chose provision of a new village Hall.
- A second event was held in Newton Leys also sharing the policies but specifically focusing parishioner views on the development of the West of Newton Leys site. There was a consensus from the 25 people that turned up that it would be acceptable if a large part of the site could provide sport and recreation facilities.
- A draft Pre-submission Plan was produced by O’NeillHomer in November

2024

- In January the Pre-Submission plan was agreed by Stoke Hammond Parish Council
- In February Regulation 14 was entered into with the consultation period commencing on 9th February and completing on 11th April. The 6-week period was extended after a few statutory consultees were missed in the first week and to allow for the Easter period.

REG 14 Consultation Process

- The Consultation Period was notified to residents in the SH News, by an individual door drop leaflet to all households in the parish and via the Stoke Hammond and Newton Leys Facebook pages. In addition, posters (Appendix C) were put up all around Stoke Hammond Village.
- During the consultation period 2 walk-In events were held in the SH Community Association Building and one in the Newton Leys Community Pavilion.
- Feedback was possible via hard copy or online through the Website where the plan could be viewed in its entirety alongside the Strategic Environmental Assessment by AECOM and the Design Code.
- The Statutory bodies, local Parish Councils and Landowners/ representatives were all notified via email with a minimum of a 6-week consultation period. (Annex D)

Pre-Submission Consultation Feedback

The Pre-Submission Plan consultation generated comments not only from members of the public but also from statutory bodies landowners and their representatives.

The Steering Group assessed all responses liaising with O'NeillHomer in determining whether amendments to the SHNP were necessary or advisable. It was felt that comments received did not challenge the fundamental principles of the Plan.

A full analysis of resident comments was made and presented in a paper to the Steering group for the April 2024 meeting. (Appendix E). In addition, O'NeillHomer provided their report on the statutory Body and landowner responses which was presented to the steering group at the same meeting. (Appendix F). The owners of all the recommended sites confirmed their satisfaction with their inclusion in the plan albeit with some agreed alterations to the Pre-Submission.

All elements of the feedback were considered by the Steering Group/O'Neillhomer and the decisions recorded in the minutes (Appendix G).

The following amendments were agreed and copied into an update of the Pre-Submission (V2).

Recommendations from O'NeillHomer

- the policies maps were revised to better illustrate the site boundaries.
- The settlement boundaries have been redrawn to include more recent developments and an explanation of the methodology for drawing the settlement boundaries added to SH1 supporting text.
- Reference to the Aylesbury Vale Design SPD has been added to the Design code.
- Further wording has been added to the supporting info for SH4 explaining in more detail why the Mount Pleasant green is demonstrably special to the local community.
- the policy wording for SH7 has been revised to place greater emphasis on addressing the 'performance gap' of new developments and clarifying that the policy should not be interpreted as requiring Passivhaus or equivalent standards, but rather acting as an incentive.
- SH8 has been changed to bring it into line with VALP Policy T6.
- Following further consultation with Pegasus group the wording of SH9 has been amended covering an agreed potential housing number, an agreed transfer of land to the Parish council for sports and recreational use, wording related to Housing Mix, in line with policy SH6, and on the need for an item on landscape and visual assessments.
- Changes to SH10 to bring it in line with VALP Policy I3.

All parishioner comments have been recorded and published on the SHPC Neighbourhood Plan website without individual names attached to protect data integrity. The following amendments were made to the Pre submission Plan V2 based on the Parishioner feedback.

- Section 2 amended to reflect some key areas in the Neighbourhood area that exist outside the SH Village and Newton Leys developments.
- Some minor changes to the supporting statements in SH8
- SH9 Site allocation NP04 - clarification has been added that should development be agreed on the existing play area, no work would commence until a new play area has been implemented.
- SH9 Site Allocation NP05 – The number of houses was changed from 30 to 20 which was an error.

- A more detailed explanation was added within Implementation with respect to S106 money and how spending of this is to be prioritised going forward.
- In the non-planning section, the Wet Well at the North end of the village has been added as an additional area of concern.

Malcolm Newing
Chair SHNP Steering Group

APPENDIX A

Report on the the Scoping Survey Numbers and Written Representations

General

The purpose of the Scoping Survey is to provide a broad perspective on the Planning Issues in play within the Stoke Hammond Parish.

The Parish has approximately 800 residents in Stoke Hammond Village and surrounding areas and 500 residents in the new Newton Leys development.

There were 96 responses to the survey with single figures from Newton Leys. The following feedback is unlikely to be at all representative of the issues felt by Newton Leys Parishioners.

Priority Order of Issues for the Community

Looking purely at the numbers managing traffic impacts were of greatest concern, whilst protecting sensitive landscapes and enhancing community facilities were deemed very important to two-thirds of respondents.

Protecting Bio diversity, preserving heritage, protecting agriculture and existing buildings maintaining their current feel was deemed very important by 50% of people.

The written comments add some additional clarity. About 40% were in favour of no further development, with 55% suggesting it should be within the village boundaries and 5% recommending building on the edge. Protecting the Villages key Green spaces was also given a significant number of mentions.

With respect to Traffic, planning concerns were largely to do with access to new developments and the growing problems or parking within the new estates, on the main road and around the village shop. Very few comments were made with respect to resolving speeding but those that did were strongly in favour of traffic calming measures.

96% of people stated the network of footpaths were important to them, reflecting their significance in peoples leisure activities. Over half of the respondents felt there was a need for additional footpaths and the written responses provided details of where these should be. A link to the 3 Locks Pub was particularly desired.

The numbers show that with respect to housing type desired two thirds favoured special housing for the elderly, first time buyers and 2/3 bedroom houses. There was negligible support for the introduction of flats.

Facilities Questions

The numbers showed a universal desire for the return of the Pub (98%). Two thirds favoured a kid's recreational area and a café. Over 50% felt there was a need for a pre school/Junior School and a chemist.

The written responses relating to teenagers and seniors showed a desire for a meeting place/café specifically for seniors and a youth club facility plus extra sporting facilities for youngsters.

The specific questions relating to the Community Centre demonstrated 50% of people felt it wasn't fit for purpose. The majority of complaints quoting it was too small and that the growing playgroup made daytime use impossible. Similarly the Sports Club was felt to be too small to provide the full range of sports facilities for the size of our current community.

The playground was largely deemed a good resource although there were some requests for improvements to accommodate older children.

The additional question with respect to the best use of Bragenham Side was largely split between 3 options. Firstly to maintain as natural green space enabling walking (with and without dogs), picnics, nature activities possibly with an Orchard. The second option was for a multi service building/Community Centre/Village hall that would be big enough to offer

daytime use and a broader range of sports facilities. The third option was to utilize the field to expand outside sports activities such as Tennis and youth football. Other less significant ideas were to use the field as allotments and as parking to support the existing community infrastructure or new ones. Clearly many of these ideas are not mutually exclusive.

The overall out take on this section is that the existing facilities do not satisfy the community need and that there is scope to extend existing or build new facilities within the community.

Landscape and Heritage

The landscape and heritage questions largely supported the value people put on being part of a village. 88% of respondents thought it very important to protect the local landscape from harmful development and 82% thought it very important to protect local gaps between the parish and surrounding urban areas. On balance landscape was deemed more important than buildings and bio diversity with 58% saying the former was very important and 55% the latter.

In particular the value of village walks was raised in writing by over half the respondents. The Church, Church Road and Old School Lane all received significant mentions and the views across the Brickhills, the Canal as well as those from the church received the most comments.

Potential Development Sites

Only 16% of respondents actually mentioned a potential development site and only 4 areas got more than one mention. These were Bragenaham Side, Community Centre and land, the field adjacent to the sports field (not Bragenham Side) and land by the Church where the old buildings exist.

Demographics

Only 57% of respondents added the postcode so its difficult to be precise how representative this is of the whole village geographically.

The age distribution of respondents was

| | |
|---------|------|
| 18 – 24 | 4% |
| 25 – 44 | 13% |
| 45 - 64 | 51 % |
| 65 – 79 | 26% |
| 80 + | 7% |

Malcolm Newing

6th March 2022

APPENDIX B

Narrative around the Call for Sites Process

We wrote to landowners with respect to 37 sites in September 2022. Of these sites 35 were on the fringes of the Stoke Hammond Historic Village and two were adjacent to the new Newton Leys South development.

We received a number of responses and sent a second letter chasing a reply on the 22nd of October to the remaining landowners.

The list was initially reduced by 16 around the village and 1 around Newton Leys due to no response being received.

Four responses were received stating they were not interested in the inclusion of their land for this exercise.

- 4 Community Association Land
- 6 Bragenham Side
- 24 Box Tree
- 28 North of Grove Farm

We received a response from two landowners for the same plot of land 11/12 little Acre. One of the landowners included it with their own adjacent site 10 SW Leighton Road. The initial response for site 10 also included land within an adjacent Parish, Soulbury, that was not included as part of our designated Neighbourhood Plan area. The resolution of this was that 11/12 Little Acre remained in the process for the land owners and the adjacent site 9/10 also remained but was reduced with Little Acre and the area in Soulbury Parish withdrawn.

The remaining 11 sites were written to in January 2023 with a request for a simple concept plan that could expand on some of the key features (e.g. housing capacity, means of access) for the site, recognising this would be for a non-strategic development that could be considered against any possible allocation the Parish might receive in the Bucks Local Plan to 2040.

At this stage two further sites fell out 21 Tumbleweed because of a Nil response and 37 Land East of Fenny 2 which was withdrawn.

One further site 11/12 Little Acre was also withdrawn having supplied a premature planning application to Bucks CC in advance of completion of the Call for Sites process.

We were therefore left with a short list of 8 sites.

- 3 West of Newton Leys
- 5 Parish Council Land
- 10 SW of Leighton Road
- 14 Hunters Lodge
- 18 North of Harrup Close
- 19 Back of Orchard End and Meadowside
- 29 North of Old School Lane
- 36 Land of East of Fenney

These sites were sent to AECOM for a strategic environmental evaluation (SEA). At the same time a 2 day Exhibition was held in March 2023 for the local residents to review progress on our plan and to provide a prioritised view on the sites

Information from these two sources was reviewed by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and a final decision taken on the sites to be included in the plan at the October 2023 Steering group.

Three of the sites were withdrawn, all of which were universally unpopular with residents.

- SW of Leighton Road – well outside the recommended village boundary and detrimental to the character of the Southern approach to the village.
- 14 Hunters Lodge – Once again deemed to extend the boundary of the village too far.
- North of Old School Lane – Detrimental to the character of the village on its Northern approach and unsuitable within the conservation area.

This leaves 5 sites for inclusion in the Neighbourhood plan, all with mitigations.

- 3 West of Newton Leys
- 5 Parish Council Land
- North of Harrup Close
- Back of Orchard End and Meadowside
- Land off East of Fenney

Malcolm Newing

Chair Stoke Hammond Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Appendix C

Formal Consultation
8th February –
11th April 2024

**TELL US
WHAT
YOU
THINK**

THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

- Clarify the content of the plan
- Answer your questions
- Discuss the 5 proposed site allocations

“
Pop in anytime
to be informed &
share your views.”

20 February 2024. 7pm – 9pm
Newton Leys Community Centre

21 February 2024. 7pm – 9pm
Stoke Hammond Community Centre

24 February 2024. 2pm – 4pm
Stoke Hammond Community Centre

See the plan at stokehammondpc.com



| APPENDIX D CONSULTEE LIST | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Name | Individual | Email |
| Anglian Water | Anglian Water | spatialplanning@anglianwater.co.uk |
| Environment Agency | Environment Agency | planning_THM@environment-agency.gov.uk |
| Highways England | Highways England | info@highwaysengland.co.uk |
| Historic England | Historic England | e-seast@historicengland.org.uk |
| Homes England | Homes England | enquiries@homesengland.gov.uk |
| Natural England | Natural England | consultations@naturalengland.org.uk |
| Network Rail | Network Rail | TownPlanningLNW@networkrail.co.uk |
| Fairhive Housing | Fairhive Housing | contact@fairhive.co.uk |
| Oxford Diocese | Oxford Diocese | David.Mason@oxford.anglican.org |
| Pegasus Group | Sarah Hamilton-Foyn | sarah.hamilton-foyn@pegasusgroup.co.uk |
| Taylor Wimpey | Emma Walton - TW South Midlands | Emma.Walton@taylorwimpey.com |
| Varsity Planning | Pippa Cheetham | pippa@varsitytownplanning.com |
| Willis Dawson | Simon Willis | simonwillis@willisdawson.co.uk |
| Buckinghamshire Council | BC Neighbourhood Planning Mailbox | Neighbourhoodplanning@buckinghamshire.gov.uk |
| Milton Keynes City Council | MKCC Planning Policy | development.plans@milton-keynes.gov.uk |
| Bletchley & Fenny Stratford TC | Bletchley & Fenny Stratford TC | info@bletchleyfennystratford-tc.gov.uk |
| Drayton Parslow PC | Drayton Parslow PC | draytonparslowclerk@gmail.com |
| Great Brickhill PC | Great Brickhill PC | karenlbarker@btinternet.com |
| Little Brickhill PC | Little Brickhill PC | clerk@littlebrickhillparishcouncil.co.uk |
| Mursley PC | Mursley PC | clerk@mursleypc.org |
| Stewkley PC | Stewkley PC | stewkleyparishclerk@gmail.com |
| Soulbury | Soulbury PC | clerk@soulburyparish.org |
| Newton Longville | Mike Galloway | Mike.Galloway@newtonlongville.gov.uk |
| Peabody | Haley Bygrave | haley.bygrave@peabody.org.uk |
| Ridge and Partners | Nick Stafford | nickstafford@ridge.co.uk |
| Andrew Gurney | Andrew Gurney | dwgurney@btconnect.com |
| Charles Kessler | Charles Kessler | cdjkessler@btinternet.com |
| Chadwell Farm | Katherine Ward | katherine.ward@yahoo.co.uk |
| Kirby Diamond | Andrew Wright/Alex Jenden | Andrew.Wright@kirbydiamond.co.uk |
| Whyte Consulting | Warren Whyte | warren@whyteconsult.co.uk |
| Hunters Lodge | Joe Read | joe@optimis-consulting.co.uk |
| Premier Property | Keith Sweetman | admin@premierproperty.ltd |
| Salsbury-Potter | Ken Tay | ken.tay@attendus.com |

APPENDIX E

STOKE HAMMOND NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REG 14

Residents Feedback: All the written comments by Policy area

Numbers Analysis

| | | | |
|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|
| Total Returns | 47 | Yes in its entirety | 12 |
| SH Parishioners | 30 | No | 7 |
| NL Parishioners | 8 | Yes with exceptions | 19 |
| Owners | 4 | | |
| Consultees | 5 | | |

My Summary

12 out of 38 supported the NP in its entirety representing 31.6%.

7 out of 38 did not support the plan representing 18.4%. Of these 6 was because of the NP 04 Parish Council Land recommendation and 1 because of NP 01 South of Newton Leys.

19 out of 38 (50 %) supported it with the comments outlined below

Yes in its Entirety

Angela Cavaye

I support in its entirety.

Keith Cavaye

I support in its entirety.

Shyam Avvari

I support in its entirety.

Nicola Dey

I support in its entirety. Thank you.

Ian Dey

I support in its entirety. Very happy thank you for all your efforts.

Paul Cadwaller

Yes, in its entirety. Thank you.

David Webber

Yes, in its entirety

Sylvia Drummond

I want whatever is best for the Village and realise why the neighbourhood plan is necessary.

Clifford Price

It is clear that a great deal of thought and care has gone into the preparation of the plan, and I am happy to support it.

Lance Cornish

I would like further clarification of the content of the plan. I intend to go along to one of the consultation sessions on the 21st or 24th February.

Beryl Hine

I wholeheartedly agree with the neighbourhood plan.

Tracy Youngs

Well, thought out. If we must have development, its better we control it somehow. Our village is special and unique and its key it remains that way.

My Summary

These are the 12 submissions that have provided unequivocal support to the entire Pre-Submission Neighbourhood plan. It represents 31.5% of all the parishioner returns.

Vision and Objectives

Dave Webber

Vision and Objective: I feel the vision should be more aspirational and specific.

My Summary

This is the only comment in this space. Judging by Daves comments in SH10 I think he is probably looking at this from the broad perspective of the Neighbourhood Plan and the S106 project, rather than the vision and objectives related to the Neighbourhood Plan alone and as a part of the Bucks Local Plan.

SH1

Robyn Gilders

Planning Policy SH1: Settlement Boundaries A) & B) and 5.43
Settlement boundaries need more clarification. As mentioned in the Design Code comment the outlying more rural properties (of which there are 9 within an enclave of converted barns)

should have a more prominent mention as, to date, they have been mostly invisible or ignored as part of SH Village. Willowbridge Marina is also not mentioned and, although this is a messy boatyard with some small industrial units that have crept in, it also needs the same protection regarding planning expansion that the rest of the village has.

My Summary

The key importance of the settlement boundary is that everything outside of it within the Parish (excluding Newton Leys) is determined to be rural and any development would be in accordance with Local Plan and NPPF rural policies which restrict building in countryside areas not in keeping with the locality. All small developments around and in local farms benefit from this protection. It maybe we should reference by name those that exist as suggested. I also think we should maybe reference the role of the Canal in our Parish and in particular Willowbridge Marina?

SH2

Robyn Gilders

Design Code:

Lots of mentions of the houses along Fenny Road. No inclusion of properties off Stoke Road from Willowbridge Marina to Mill Lane. Maybe they come under outlying more rural properties but they are residential and there are 9 of them and they need to be recognised. They are not farms but converted outbuildings and should not be lumped in with Chadwell and Rectory Farms.

Once again and finally please include mention of Willowbridge Marina (the rural boatyard on the northern boundary of SH), the permanent moorings and the enclave of converted residential barns (of which there are 8). We need the same protections that apply to the rest of Stoke Hammond Village in the Neighbourhood Plan

Anthony McGee

SH2: this section should include restrictions on Dormer windows, linked to parts A & D, e.g., privacy. Otherwise, developers will build 2 story houses, with a Dormer, which is not in keeping with most of the village or privacy.

Mathew Hammond

Design Code

The Mellows development and recently submitted plans for the addition phases of the development (although named differently) are currently not adhering to the design code. The developer has tried to put forward 2 1/2 / 3 storey building in contrary to Code 5.

The proposed 2 house extension to the Mellows also contradicts Code 4 in that the buildings proposed being 180 degrees out of alignment with Harrup Close. No 2 and No 4 Harrup Close will have reduced daylight from overshadowing and headlight/streetlight spill to their rear elevations and gardens at night if this gets planning approval.

The Mellows development is also intending to fell all the existing conifers that currently

surround the plot in contradiction to Code 7 which will open up the whole area to higher volume of noise from passing trains and the bypass which no mitigation methods have been put forwarded currently on the Mellows or any of the proposed phases.

My summary

My summary to SH2 with respect to outlying areas, the canal and Willowbridge Marina is the same as SH 1 and perhaps the design code should be amended to include relevant statements for these specific sites?

The comment on Dormer windows seems reasonable and should perhaps be included?

The Mellows is an already agreed application and I don't believe the 'unmade NP' can have any impact. Once made however it can be used for any subsequent developments in the Mellows area.

SH3

Stephen Clarke

b The list of local heritage assets excludes the ancient "mote" farm site in the northeast corner of the Moat Farm field. In 1991 the county council archaeological department determined that this was an early 13th century dwelling of significant importance. (Ref page 15).

My Summary

It makes sense to include Mote Farm site if Stephen has supporting evidence.

SH4

Stephen Clarke

Green Infrastructure

- a. Appendix C ignores the community centre and associated playing field land with the playground facilities. This is clearly an error (ref5.10)
- b. The plan is silent on the importance of the recreational cluster in Bragenham Side with the sports club and its NPFA land together with the community centre and its playing field land and facilities.
- c. I would expect the plan to set out a strategy as to how the parish council will work in partnership with the local authority to enhance these facilities and ensure a sustainable future for the parish through to 2030.

Beryl Hine

I want to support the limiting of new house building in our village. As a member of this community, I deeply value the charm and character that our village possesses, largely due to its small size and abundant green spaces.

Preserving our green spaces is essential not only for maintaining the aesthetic appeal of our village but also for promoting environmental sustainability and biodiversity. These green areas

provide valuable habitats for wildlife, contribute to air quality, and offer residents opportunities for outdoor recreation and relaxation.

Additionally, limiting new house building is crucial for managing the growth of our village in a sustainable manner. By controlling development, we can avoid overcrowding, traffic congestion and strain on local infrastructure and services.

In summary, I urge for the priority to be the preservation of our village's unique character and green spaces by supporting measures to limit new house building and ensuring future generations can continue to enjoy the beauty and tranquility of our community.

Cameron Clark

I support the retention of Mount Pleasant Green as an open green space, with no buildings or houses, and request removal of the boundary fence.

Simon Walker

I have no objections in principal with the village plan and the identification of future development sites and am grateful for the work invested in this vision.

I have some comments which are based upon greater clarification as opposed to be critical of the plans per se.

In relation to the designated green areas, I completely agree that the space should remain green if possible, it does present a nice entry to the village. I would suggest that given its position it will be less communal than is promoted, I would also add that it is my understanding that this land is not owned by SHPC which would suggest this would need to be purchased. This was unclear in the proposal

Tracey Shenton

SH4 Green infrastructure - feeling frustrated that developers can rip out hedges and face no consequences (new development in Fenny Road) so I am fearful for what will be destroyed in future developments. Homes for birds, wildflowers for pollinators, hedges and through routes for the current population of hedgehogs get no mention at all. Deplorable. Very depressing for any young people growing up in this nature depleted village.

My Summary

Reasonable request to include the green space owned by the Community Association/PARISH Council in Appendix C and this should be added as should the parish owned Bragenham Side field.

The retention of MP Green has only received support which is positive. With respect to Simons queries whilst its true the Green historically was mainly used by residents of Mount Pleasant there were never any restrictions in terms of physical barriers or resident complaints to others using the facility. It is currently fenced off by the owners and this is subject to a current objection with Bucks legal department. My understanding is that if it is included as a protected space in a made plan it would be safe from development. We would not need to purchase the land although this could be an option in the future.

The importance of the Bragenham Side area is accepted by everyone in terms of its importance as an open green space and for recreation purposes. There is no issue with reinforcing this with a statement if it is felt necessary? Maybe we should also include reference to the importance of the canal and its impact on Biodiversity, both plants and creatures in the area?

Tracey's comments are clearly from the heart. We chose not to have a specific policy on biodiversity because the Local Plan and NPPF are already very strong in insisting all developments must be net positive in biodiversity impact. We could separate out a specific Policy area if people felt it necessary or simply add some more powerful wording to this policy.

SH5

Stephen Clarke

Cycling and pedestrian infrastructure

- a. The plan misses the opportunity to work with the local authority to enhance the cycling and pedestrian opportunities to rewild Leighton Road back to its look and feel as a C road. BCC has implemented a few rewilding schemes in Bucks and this should be encouraged in the plan.
- b. Similarly, Sustrans originally wanted the national cycle network to run through the village and not along the canal tow path. This was a compromise as the road was still an A road. This is no longer the case and I would expect the plan to support an initiative with the council and Sustrans to reroute the national cycle path through the village as originally proposed.

Hazel Turner

SH5 Footpaths and rights of way require better maintenance, funds should be allocated on an annual basis to ensure this happens by SHPC/NL.

Garry Christopher

SH5 detail is what exactly.

Tracey Shenton

SH5 Sustainable travel - repairs to roads & canal tow paths to make it safer and easier to cycle to work.

My Summary

I think Garry's comment indicates this is an area we have possibly given insufficient focus. Perhaps we should look to Stephen's comments and set out some broad objectives that might feed into a future Parish Plan? He has long argued the concept of reducing the size of the road so it becomes a B road? and maybe we should establish cycle paths on the roads around and into the village ?

SH 6

My Summary

I think the total lack of any comments on Housing Mix is a reasonable indication that the Policy reflects peoples view on what the Housing need is and what the mix should be on new developments going forward. There will always be specific views on particular sites and areas within the parish but protection for these variations comes via the Design code.

SH 7

My Summary

This whole section is way too complicated for mere mortals including me!!!!

SH 8

Anthony McGee

2) SH8: 5.44 - Parish Council should look to support those roads / residents looking to get their roads adopted.

3) SH8: 5.55 - disappointing that feedback on village shop parking has been ignored. With increased development, this will only get worse. There are low effort, low cost solutions to create parking and a better traffic flow, which should have been considered in the Plan.

4) SH8: 5.59 - EV charging proposal opposite The Green is not fit for purpose. This will turn into Dolphin parking. Other areas should be explored, even if less 'Central'. Not a large village to walk.

Shyam Awari

I would like to support and press on the urgency of the traffic management proposal in section 5.53 to be implemented.

I understand a roundabout or traffic light system would take some time to plan and mature but in the interim a speed limit restriction should be implemented from just before the stoke Rd-Drayton Rd-Newton Rd junction all the way to the A4146 round about.

Let me know if I can post this Newton Leys Community Facebook page so you get more responses in this regard.

Roland Shepherd

Electric Vehicle charging Point

The proposed siting of an electric vehicle charging point on the pavement area opposite the village green is not a viable proposition due to Highway Planning Regulations which were required and implemented when Manor Close estate was built in 1994.

At this time our entire roadside boundary wall was moved back from the road to provide a 90-metre vision splay for the safe exit of vehicles from the estate road, hence the wide pavement. This proposal would cause a serious vision problem and would contravene Highway Planning Regulations.

Speed Limits

Proposal for chicanes each end of the village might help to deter the speed through the village which is currently a big problem. Priority should be given to vehicles leaving the village and a narrowing as well may also deter HGV vehicles from using the village instead of the by-pass. Speed humps would not be acceptable to residents.

The official speed camera in Fenny Road should be working at all times

A pedestrian crossing warning sign which should be lit is also needed at the top of hill by Tyrells Manor.

Bus Stop on village green

This bus stop requires clearly marking on the road to alleviate improper parking which is now an issue in the village. The bus often has to stop in the road for drop off and pickup of passengers blocking the road. Highway code states "No parking with 6 metres of bus stop".

Faye Thomassen

1) SH8: If there are more houses there will be more traffic and so we need added traffic infrastructure to cope with it to ensure there are no extra delay during commuting hours 2) SH8 5.53: Newton Leys South entrance has restricted views and so requires a roundabout, especially if there is to be an increase in traffic

Hazel Turner

SH8 Traffic Management: Bus Stop on the Green requires lines to indicate No Parking; in order that the 70 Bus is able to stop safely. Currently drivers are parking in front of it.

Newton Road. Improvement for pedestrians needed for area from the Railway Bridge to the concrete road. Suggest a new pavement to the gate.

Tracey Shenton

SH8 Traffic Management - please make Newton Road railway bridge traffic lights with a WIDE pavement leading to a safe pavement to link with concrete farmer's track. This is a highly used circular walk which is incredibly dangerous for pedestrians, young cyclists, pushchair and wheelchair users. It's awful to be using the road over a blind summit. More houses will mean more drivers thus increasing the chances of an awful accident.

Thank you very much for all your hard work on this.

Valerie Shepherd

Electric Vehicle Charging Point would contravene Highway Planning regulations

Due to Highway Planning Regulations requiring a 90 metre clear vision splay for the Manor Close entry/exit when it was built in 1994 and our entire boundary wall being moved back to

enable this to happen, which is why there is a wide pavement here, it would cause a blind spot for anyone leaving Manor Close. Therefore, it should not go ahead.

Bus Stop on village green

The Bus Stop requires clearly marking on the road to alleviate improper parking which is now an issue in the village.

The bus often has to stop in the road for drop off and pick up of passengers blocking the road. Anyone who is disabled or with a pram has to come off the pavement and then climb onto the bus.

The Highway Code states "No parking within 6 metres of a bus stop."

Adrian Howard

SH08 (Traffic Management)

Newton Leys South

It is vital that prompt action is taken to remove the major congestion and inherent dangers at the Junction of Lansbury road and Drayton road.

With no speed limits traffic using the Drayton road in both directions regularly exceeds even the basic 60 mph limit and many coming from the Drayton direction are unaware that our estate is there and some even try to overtake vehicles turning into Lansbury Rd.

The minimum we would expect is for speed limits to be placed bring the limit down to 30 as you approach the junction. My preference would be limits plus the addition of a roundabout which would allow flow at all times but especially during the peak as it would allow traffic coming in and out of Lansbury turning right some chance to progress their journey. A roundabout instead of traffic lights would also allow the farm access without the need for a light sequence to include an irregular access requirement.

If the NP01 proposal does go ahead the matter will only get worse at this junction and would suggest a roundabout at that four way junction sooner rather than later, as I feel that the increase of traffic at the Drayton Rd/A4146 roundabout will force some drivers to use the Stoke Hammond route as a rat run.

Tracey Howard

SH08 (Traffic Management)

Newton Leys South

It is vital that prompt action is taken to remove the major congestion and inherent dangers at the Junction of Lansbury road and Drayton road.

With no speed limits traffic using the Drayton road in both directions regularly exceeds even the basic 60 mph limit and many coming from the Drayton direction are unaware that our estate is there and some even try to overtake vehicles turning into Lansbury Rd.

The minimum we would expect is for speed limits to be placed bring the limit down to 30 as you approach the junction. My preference would be limits plus the addition of a roundabout which would allow flow at all times but especially during the peak as it would allow traffic coming in and out of Lansbury turning right some chance to progress their journey. A roundabout instead of traffic lights would also allow the farm access without the need for a light sequence to include an irregular access requirement.

If the NP01 proposal does go ahead the matter will only get worse at this junction and would suggest a roundabout at that four way junction sooner rather than later, as I feel that the

increase of traffic at the Drayton Rd/A4146 roundabout will force some drivers to use the Stoke Hammond route as a rat run.

Malcolm Brown

Because the traffic measures imposed, and the speed watch grouping is not effective or regular enough, other measures need to be put into force., soon, for the safety of people within the village.

Traffic speeds , and the offending number of cars, appear to be increasing and to our view , the only way of sufficiently calming road traffic speeds is by the implementation of rumble strips(1st choice) or chicane (2nd choice).

This we feel is the only way to prevent potential harm , to any individual, in future so, the cost ought to be easily justifiable.

Robyn Gilders

Manage harmful effects of traffic and parking.

If yellow lines are painted by The Dolphin Pub, where do people park? If they can't park will the pub have a decline in people frequenting it from outside the village?

Traffic density and speed are a problem. Stoke Hammond area seems to be used as a rat run through to L. Buzzard despite the bypass. Fixed speed displays could help?

Policy SH8: Traffic Management:

Section b) says garage spaces counted as towards total parking space requirement and that "use of the garage" in perpetuity should be secured by planning conditions.

Garages are no longer used for parking cars. They are not big enough to house the current trend for large vehicles or even for smaller vehicles! Garages are used for storage or converting into living space because they are not fit for purpose. Developers and planning need to update specifications for garages or put in place more outside parking space for residents on new developments.

Mathew Hammond

SH8 Traffic Management

Section 5.59 The proposal for reducing the main road through Stoke Hammond for the sake of two EV charging bays should be removed in my opinion. This section of road is dangerous enough and needs addressing before a serious accident occurs. 6 junctions in a short section of road, a pub and a bus stop warrant double yellow/red lines. Residents and visitors parking on the pavements across from the many junctions in that section of road, reduce visibility plays and force traffic onto the wrong side of the road around a bend with little to no visibility of oncoming traffic. Alternative parking for local residents affected should be accommodated elsewhere.

The same can be said for the local shop. A lack of clear parking restrictions/bays results in dangerous vehicle movements and restricted access to Old Bell Close, Lodge Lane and Harrup Close on a daily basis. This can affect deliveries, refuse collections and emergency services access. This is particularly worrying for the local elderly residents who rely on delivery services, mobility access and health care.

In general the whole village would warrant funds allocating to improving the parking and road safety measures within the village.

My Summary

This section generated the most comments after the site allocations. Its not surprising and largely reflects peoples concerns with the existing traffic issues within the village and at Newton Leys. I'm not sure if there are any specific policy elements to address but would ask Greg to have a detailed look, please as this was very much his baby.

SH9

Stephen Clarke

1. Moat Farm land

a. You state that you wrote to 36 local landowners for a call for sites. I can confirm that no such letter was sent to me regarding the Moat Farm land. We are currently working on a plan to reinstate the original barns as dwellings and to reopen the road access into the farm. The aim is to reinstate the barns and rick yards together with the access to the Moat Farm land as it was in the 1960's (ref point 4.2).

Parish Council land

a. NP04 states the the council's land around the community centre can be developed. The conditions to bring this site forward for development are considerable. Firstly, the council would need to provide a recreational cluster that demonstrates "betterment" to the current arrangements. Secondly, it would need planning and to be fully funded. Thirdly, the council would need to agree with the local authority a financial payment to release the covenant on the land. Lastly any such scheme would need the full support of the Sports Association, NPFA, Community Association, the PCC and BCC. Given these risks and the lack of support in principle from the key stakeholders I would recommend that this was removed from the pipeline of sites.

Anthony McGee

5) SH9: NP02 - given that the adjacent and approved 16 houses, that would use the same entry road were approved with cladding and other downgraded materials, the ability of the plan to enforce materials in keeping with the Conservation Area is limited. Whilst it may be an infill, it will be to further detriment of the Conservation Area and Newton Road access / congestion. Given the scale of other options in the Plan, these 2 houses may seem an easy win, but are detrimental, superfluous and the wrong answer.

6) SH9: NP05 - doesn't account for the 2x planning applications for a total of 19 houses, in this

area. This would exit onto the smallest of the 3 entry / exit roads in the village - not appropriate to further increase pressure, given the 37 houses / flats which may arise from the new development adjacent to Methodist Church.

Denise Harris

The area is right on the outskirts of Newton Leys - the reason I purchased a house on edge of the estate was to look out over farmland and not backs of houses. I would be concerned about security of my home if houses were built so close, noise pollution - it's bad enough hearing traffic roaring up the lanes to Newton Longville or on the bypass as it is, saleability of my home and potential injuries befalling my pets. It seems there is far too many houses being built already on NL but no infrastructure to support - struggle to get doctors appointment as nothing nearby, no NHS dentists and only two entrances into the whole estate so heavy traffic build up already on the roads in and outside of the estate.

Roland Shepherd

Site Allocations - Flood Risk

With reference to any future development areas, serious consideration must be given to the village flood risk as during my 70 years here, it has been an issue on numerous occasions over the years, still remember the barrels floating out of the pub and adjacent properties also under water.

The recently allowed developments, far above our village allocation along with any new proposed developments can only make the situation worse, hence the recent flooding of houses on the village green this January.

The brook is also taking run off from the bypass.

Unless brook maintenance is done on a regular basis our current brook system will not cope with future heavy downpours. Widening could be a consideration.

Mel D'Agostino

Am not in agreement about using recreational land for building

Robert Dudley

I do not support the proposal. I find the proposal for yet more development of Newton Leys South (NLS) to be unwelcome, inappropriate and in the case of this specific site, unwarranted.

It is unwelcome because the proposed location is on a tiny parcel of land that is directly adjacent to a junction (Stoke Road and Drayton Road) which is hazardous and which already suffers from traffic congestion at peak times. The congestion will be further compounded by the proposed single in/out access point being located within a short distance of this narrow road and busy junction which is used by large lorries that cut through to reach the A421. The development will inevitably bring more traffic and will negatively impact traffic flow at this junction where peak time delay will become even more inevitable and where the somewhat blind junction, with traffic coming fast down Drayton Road towards Newton Leys, representing an escalation of the hazard to those looking to exit Stoke Road on to Drayton Road. An additional 100 to 200 cars coming to and from this estate will indisputably add to the hazard

and a study of driver behaviour at this junction is highly recommended.

Other traffic congestion problems exist too in that there is also no proposal to enhance estate access or improve traffic management at the Lansbury Road entrance and exit, which gets very busy and backed up at peak times and which also feeds on to the Drayton Road and Stoke road route that goes from Newton Leys to Newton Longville. The Newton Leys south development will further exacerbate traffic flows along all of these routes and access points and again a peak-time traffic flow study is highly recommended.

The proposal is also unwelcome in that one can see that developers on the overall NL site have already and easily managed to squeeze more than 100 homes out of similar small parcels of land on the estate, and to compound things further, the properties that are built are arguably unattractive and nondescript, further devaluing the aesthetic of the area not just by their very presence but through their featureless appearance.

An additional 70, 100 or whatever the final number of houses is going to be will further and unavoidably contribute to the ongoing suppression of house prices on this estate due to the never-ending over-build, saturation and over-supply in the Newton Leys area.

The proposal is unwelcome in that the NL site has only recently received yet another and extant house-building proposal, next to the industrial waste disposal site, to the north of the NLS site, from Taylor Wimpey (submitted a proposal for an additional 113 houses in October 23). Residents complaining of the ongoing smell from that site has not deterred the developers from seeking to propose another 113 houses adjacent to the site.

The proposal is unwarranted in that there is no provision for any extra doctor, dentist, school, visitor parking or retail services to accompany the build. How can this be acceptable? Local services are already stretched to breaking point. How can landowners and developers be allowed just to continuously sell land and profit from new property build without having an obligation to provide any services to the children and new families of an increasingly dense urbanised environment which their very actions have enabled?

It is inappropriate in that this overall NL site, which has been under non-stop development for more than ten years, has only seen road surfacing take place in the last month or so. Residents, having paid premium prices for their houses, have had to endure unsurfaced roads throughout these ten years and are surely due some relief from the never-ending construction traffic, builders, mud, dirt, regular and on-site punctured tires (which are never reimbursed) and overall day to day congestion and noise.

The proposal contains no new healthcare or education or transport provisions and represents a win only for the land-owners when they sell the land and the home-builders when they sell their expensive properties, as many as possible of which we can be certain will be squeezed into this tiny plot to leverage the maximum possible yield, irrespective of what any arbitrary proposals may suggest at this time.

An example of the lack of commitment by developers to provide residents any basic services is that the Newton Leys site has a large number of buses regularly running through the narrow roads of the estate. Whilst this in itself represents a hazard, as cars and buses squeeze past each other, the fact is that no proper bus stops with shelters and timetables have ever been provided, even after ten years. What impression does that give to residents who year after year have no shelter from the weather conditions or know when a bus might come? Along with the unsurfaced roads, what message does this send to the residents from the developers. Why would anyone expect existing residents to find more of this indifference to be acceptable?

This unwanted and further development will add to an ongoing reduction in the local quality of

life in that it will add to local congestion, visual and noise pollution and represents an over-build and over-exploitation of a limited space. There is no direct benefit to existing residents and the proposal demonstrates an overall lack of imagination and commitment by the authorities concerned to identify, invest and support the planning, design and development of an appropriately sited and properly served community. This proposal is ad-hoc and imply an opportunistic bolt-on with no obvious merit. It adds to the existing problems and in my opinion solves nothing.

Michael De Silva

I refer to NP02 North of Harrup Close:

This area as stated is in the village conservation area. If approval for any development in the conservation area is suggested, then this may give precedent to any development of the conservation area. Noting that the Mellows development (now started) has already encroached with the access road through the edge of the conservation area.

Furthermore any development in this area would in my view go against the the Design Code which states that 'No loss of existing trees or hedges to form new or wider plot access'. I do not see how it would be possible to develop this area without the loss of trees over and above those already lost as part of the Mellows development.

Where would access be gained to the site NP02 as it not shown in the plan?

I refer to NP05 Back of Orchard End and Meadowside:

I assume that this area of development would be accessed through the access road for the Mellows development which would mean that a road through the conservation area approved for the 16 properties would now cater for an additional 30 houses.

Hazel Turner

SH9 Against NP04: With small children, on a daily basis in and around the area of the community Centre and the loss of the play equipment this site allocation should be dismissed with forthwith. Unless the play equipment is reallocated to the field next door and a large safety fence erected around the Comm Centre.

Garry Christopher

SH9 Out of the original options listed I believe that the 5 chosen are the ones least likely to severely affect the current village environment and would hope that the option 5 would be the last one to be activated on this list or at least wait till I snuff it. I do believe some of the original choices might have been a little flexible with the risk of flooding as option 9/10 has been shown in recent weeks to have an awful lot of water coming off the fields and into the brook, the lower end of option 29 also gets very marshy but presumably can be dealt with by appropriate measures.

Kim Cornell

We feel that as we have surpassed the number of new housings within Stoke hammond. We should not be subjected to further building within our Parish because Aylesbury Vale have filed in their duty to provide the housing needed.

We also completely object to the area deemed as possibly suitable on the Community Centre land in Bragenham Side. The Park and Community Centre are very widely used. The play park I assume would have to be demolished and reassembled elsewhere in the village. The traffic chaos will be far worse than it is now in Bragenham Side with the extra houses that could be built on that land. Also, there is a covenant on that land from Bucks CC themselves. Are they just going to disregard this because it suits now?

Peter Kenneth Morgan(Land Owner)

I consider the Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan to be very well written with a particular emphasis upon the young and the elderly of the Stoke Hammond community and supported by a good evidence basis to justify the five site allocations.
As a landowner I fully support the allocations proposed by you and look forward to helping the Parish Council realise their vision for the future of Stoke Hammond.

Geoffrey Lane

I DO NOT WANT ANY building on NP04 Parish Council land around the Community Centre. Without a Buckinghamshire Local Plan a Neighbourhood Plan has no value.

Ann Payne

Buckinghamshire doesn't have a local plan so a neighbourhood plan without that is worthless. There should be NO building whatsoever on NP04 Parish Council land behind the Community Centre.

Lynda White

It is not quite clear from the maps what exactly is going on at NP04 and NP05. The inset maps help a bit, but I am hoping for reassurance that current playground area next to the Community Centre would remain intact.

S Johnson

Do not agree with building behind the community centre.

Adrian Howard

Policy SH9 (Site Allocation) NP01 I can fully understand the reasoning behind the Newton Leys site being the first choice as it has little or no impact on Stoke Hammond village itself. And although not objecting to the proposal itself I do have to major concerns. Although fully supportive of a recreation field as part of the site my concern is that with the addition of changing facilities it takes it from a normal kick about field for the youngsters on the estate to a level where in all probability matches will be played on a fairly regular basis. I cannot see on existing plan anywhere enough parking for a Home and away Team, now doubt parking would firstly impact those roads and occupants on that estate, but with a footpath going from Stoke Road past the Allotments it would not take long for people to find and park in Dickens Lane, Harris Close, and Larner Close etc. Although fully supportive of a recreation field as part of the site my concern is that with the addition of changing facilities it takes it from a normal kick about field for the youngsters on the estate to a level where in all probability matches will be played on a fairly regular basis. I cannot see on existing plan anywhere enough parking for a Home and away Team, now doubt parking would firstly impact those roads and occupants on

that estate, but with a footpath going from Stoke road past the Allotments it would not take long for people to find and park in Dickens Lane, Harris Close, and Larnar Close etc. Our side of Newton Leys South is in effect a dead end with the only access via Hopkins Road or Missenden Street, street parking is already an issue with some residents not using their driveways and addition non-resident parking although not regular would impact us all and may in fact create access problems for emergency services.

Tracey Howard

Policy SH9 (Site Allocation) NP01 I can fully understand the reasoning behind the Newton Leys site being the first choice as it has little or no impact on Stoke Hammond village itself. And although not objecting to the proposal itself I do have to major concerns. Although fully supportive of a recreation field as part of the site my concern is that with the addition of changing facilities it takes it from a normal kick about field for the youngsters on the estate to a level where in all probability matches will be played on a fairly regular basis. I cannot see on existing plan anywhere enough parking for a Home and away Team, now doubt parking would firstly impact those roads and occupants on that estate, but with a footpath going from Stoke Road past the Allotments it would not take long for people to find and park in Dickens Lane, Harris Close, and Larnar Close etc. Although fully supportive of a recreation field as part of the site my concern is that with the addition of changing facilities it takes it from a normal kick about field for the youngsters on the estate to a level where in all probability matches will be played on a fairly regular basis. I cannot see on existing plan anywhere enough parking for a Home and away Team, now doubt parking would firstly impact those roads and occupants on that estate, but with a footpath going from Stoke road past the Allotments it would not take long for people to find and park in Dickens Lane, Harris Close, and Larnar Close etc. Our side of Newton Leys South is in effect a dead end with the only access via Hopkins Road or Missenden Street, street parking is already an issue with some residents not using their driveways and addition non-resident parking although not regular would impact us all and may in fact create access problems for emergency services.

Edward White

We do not concur with the proposal NP04 to build houses on Parish Council owned land next to the Community Centre. The facility has been heavily invested and developed over many years and has been widely used by generations of children. It also has the advantage of being next to the Community Centre and Sports Field. Based on previous experience with developers this facility would be immediately destroyed, and any replacement would be delayed for many years and be in a less central space to the detriment of children playing together. New houses would destroy the village atmosphere and suffocate what is the only real open green area in the village.

Krystyna Brown

Proposed development beside the Community Centre. This land was purchased on behalf of the residents of Stoke Hammond to enhance the land already owned by the village in the curtilage of the CC. The CC is owned by the village who bought it with donations and fundraising on behalf of the village. The outline plan is to leave the CC as a school, if that business ceases the lease the centre will become a derelict white elephant if the plan is to build a new CC. At present the village does not have a CC as by day it is occupied by a nursery. If used during the evening it is decorated by nursery artwork which is very unwelcoming.

The new proposed building site beside the CC is a complete No. The thought of a road running beside the CC rules out the idea of using the centre as a school. There are no parking

spaces for the proposed site. By building on the proposed site this would open up all the field which runs from behind the CC to the land up and beyond Tyrells Manor and Tyrells Road

Malcolm Brown

I don't support the neighbourhood plan for the reasons covered in my wife's response.

Mathew Hammond

Thank you for your efforts putting this together. I have a few comments which I hope you will consider implementing:

Neighbour Hood Plan

It was a shame to see that the 3 largest most viable sites on the edges of the 3 entrances to the village were discounted in lieu of smaller plots in and around existing residents which will cause considerably more disruption to the village and neighbouring residents.

It is a shame that the Mellows development has gone ahead which is now leading to further phases NP02 & NP05, (albeit all named differently on the planning portal, which seem somewhat deliberate/suspect). I'm still not clear how planning was granted for the access road through two perfectly nice bungalows, one of which within the conservation area and through the former gardens and tennis court of the listed Stoke Lodge. Not to mention that it's also a Green Infrastructure route...

Policy Maps

As discussed during the walk in, the main policy map is not clear due to the inset blocks. This really needs amending to remove the inset boxes or make them transparent as this makes the overall impact of the neighbour plan hard to envisage. The insets also crop NP02, 04 & 05 from view so the extents of the plots and impact they have are not clear.

SEA Report

Site 18 (NP02) in the report was the worst scoring plots and not surprising as the majority of the land shown is conservation area and green infrastructure network. The small area to the Southwest corner of the plot is where the proposed two houses are intended as an extension from the Mellows development. We discussed during the walk-in session that this report should be amended to remove the conservation and green network part of this site. ie. only show the plot of land where the 2 houses are proposed

My Summary

Clearly there will be input of significance from O'Neill Homer as some of these sites have been subject to significant comment from developers and Statutory Consultees. I will however summarise feedback by site from residents. One general observation is that many comments indicate that some residents think they were commenting on actual applications rather than the simple possibility of the site being recommended for consideration.

NP 01 Land South of Newton Leys

There were comments from 4 residents, two of them objected largely on the grounds of increased traffic and growing development with a growing shortfall in accompanying infrastructure. Two other residents, a husband and wife, did not want to object to the development but had concerns over the impact of sports on the field and there perhaps being a lack of parking. Overall, the degree of concern shown by the residents of Newton Leys appears to be minimal.

NP02 land North of Harrods Close

There were 3 specific objections to this site from Harrup Close residents. Most complaints about this development refer to it being in the conservation area, and it would put extra traffic onto Newton Road.

NP05 Orchard End and Meadowside

The same people objected to this site as to NP 02, and again the reasons are largely traffic related. The response on both sites is minimal which fits with the reason the sites were chosen. The point was made that the Policy Maps need clarifying on the area impacted and I would concur with this.

NP03 Land East of Fenny

There were no objections received specific to this site and the only comment received was from the site owner.

NP04 Parish Council Land

There were 10 objections received to this land being considered for inclusion in the plan. This should be balanced however against the 26 residents who put it as their first choice in the March 2023 exhibition. Stephen Clarke's response was the most thoughtful. His objection was over the hurdles that need to be crossed if we were to develop the site and on his view that 'Lastly any such scheme would need the full support of the Sports Association, NPFA, Community Association, the PCC and BCC. Given these risks and the lack of support in principle from the key stakeholders he was opposed'. He is correct there are hurdles to overcome but this has always been the case, the potential benefits make the consideration worth the effort. His view on lack of support for this initiative is presumptuous without any corroborative information. The opportunity should be kept alive as the S106 project gathers pace and all possibilities for developing the Bragenham Side arena are given due consideration.

In summary the question for the steering group will be Is there anything in the feedback above and in the feedback from the Statutory bodies that should change our decision on the sites included in the plan?

SH 10

Stephen Clarke

S106

a. Neighbourhood plans provide parish councils an opportunity to set out a strategic plan as to where they would like to see future s106 monies distributed by the local authorities to fund local infrastructure needs. To exclude this is a missed opportunity.

Faye Thomassen

3) SH10: Require a doctor and/or dentist at Newton Leys if there is a further increase of residents in the area.

David Webber

Policy SH10: Should more clearly identify expectations re A) school provision b) how any plans for a purpose-built community centre will be progressed.

Simon Walker

Given the very low number of responses in the 2020 survey, of less than 8%, any conclusions are subject to a gross extrapolation. On the major issue of the S106 funding that would be available to invest in the village, I feel there would be the need for another consultation with the communities based upon a more comprehensive set of proposals.

Whilst I recognise that all of the plans will be subject to further investigation and qualifications, I would like to see much greater details relating to the investing of the S106 money as this seems to be the portion of the plan in direct control of SHPC but seems light on detail.

The objectives seem to be overwhelmingly in favour of expanding the sports facilities which currently exist in the village and given the recent and future development plans this would make total sense. You only have to look at Great Brickhill and its focus around the Cricket Club facility to see what a difference this could make to Stoke Hammond and the new generations.

The options appear to be to develop existing facilities, namely the Community Center and/or the Sports Club and/or invest in new development in the form of a village hall.

It was suggested that the Community Center wasn't fit for purpose as it wasn't available during the day for activities. Not sure if this makes it not fit for purpose? It was also indicated that the Sports Club was deemed too small to accommodate the increased sporting activities. Without any further context it is difficult to determine where this opinion comes from. There was no mention of what the new sporting facilities are to be. I would expect that give the village youth football team currently plays at Leon School, then a new football pitch/pitch would be required. Also, enhancements to the cricket side would be also obvious. This is a land consideration.

In terms of facilities it seems perfectly reasonable to expect a feasibility study to be carried out on the cost of a new facility as opposed to developing either the Community Center or the Sports Club to develop new facilities to host new sporting activities, such as showers, changing rooms, kitchen etc, as well as expansion to accommodate more wider village activities anticipated, perhaps a Badminton Court? as well as committee rooms.

Given both existing village facilities have the space to be expanded, it feels it would make sense to accommodate the needs of a 'village hall' into a redevelopment option.

Without any high-level costing estimates hard to tell. I would also be interested in the experience of any other villages who have had similar decisions to make.

Beryl Hine

I wanted to address a growing concern that many of us have regarding our beloved community centre. It has come to our attention that the community centre, a vital hub for our village, is sadly under-utilised.

The primary reason for this seems to be the exclusive use of the facility by Buttons Nursery throughout the week .. and now including holidays also. While I understand the importance of accommodating local businesses (although she is not local, and neither are many of the users) it is disheartening to see a valuable resource largely inaccessible to the wider community. Many of us believe that the community centre should serve as a vibrant space for social gatherings, events and activities that benefit residents of all ages. However, the current

arrangement significantly limits our ability to utilise this space for such purposes. With the recent expansion of our village and the construction of new houses, the need for a functional and accessible village hall has become more pressing than ever. A well-maintained village hall would not only provide a venue for community events but also foster a sense of cohesion and belonging among residents, both new and old. Therefore, I am advocating for a more equitable use of the community centre for establishing a dedicated village hall that meets the needs of our growing community. What we require is a new village hall on the existing field that is just used by dog walkers, which would create a welcoming space that enhances the quality of life for all residents young and old.

My Summary

There is nothing much to disagree with in the comments captured under this policy. It was a late addition to the plan to provide a focus on community resources, that given recent past development and considering possible future development, need to grow. The Neighbourhood Plan was always seen as a stepping stone to producing the Vision, Strategy and Plan that Stephen, Simon, Beryl, Dave and Faye have referenced. The S106 project is the vehicle for this but it needs a broad range of parishioners to now get involved if the requirements requested are to be delivered.

Local Infrastructure Improvements

Robyn G

Finally, there needs to be a serious update of the Stoke Hammond wet well at the south end of the lay-by on Fenny Road, north of the main village. The wet well was upgraded in the 1990s or thereabouts with the addition of Stoke House (now The Lindens Residential Home) to the mains sewer. Since then, there have been 6 estates/housing developments built in Stoke Hammond plus 2 additional extensions to The Lindens and 4 further properties added to the mains sewer in the enclave of barn conversions south of Willowbridge Marina.

The wet well no longer supports the sewage and grey water discharged, creating overflow onto the verge and into the local field.

Any further housing development plans submitted in the village need to be weighed up accordingly. Infrastructure needs to be adequate to support the changes.

My Summary

A Parish plan needs to be produced beyond the Neighbourhood Plan and in conjunction with the S106 project to determine where the gaps truly exist between the services we currently have and those that are needed to be repaired or replenished. This would need to be done in conjunction with Bucks Council and the main service providers, such as Anglian, who are responsible for the service provision.

Malcolm Newing

Chair Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

20th April 2024

APPENDIX F



STOKE HAMMOND NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

REGULATION 14 ANALYSIS NOTE OF STATUTORY BODY REPRESENTATIONS

APRIL 2024

1. Introduction

1.1 This note summarises the representations made by the statutory bodies on the Pre-Submission version of the Stoke Hammond Neighbourhood Plan (SHNP) during its recent 'Regulation 14' consultation period. It recommends the main modifications to the SHNP so that it may be submitted to the local planning authority, Buckinghamshire Council (BC), to arrange for its examination and referendum.

2. Representations

2.1 Representations have been received from:

1. BC
2. Natural England
3. Historic England
4. Milton Keynes City Council (MKCC)
5. Newton Longville Parish Council (NLPC)
6. Bletchley and Fenny Stratford Town Council (BFSTC)
7. Peter Kenneth Morgan (Land east of Fenny)
8. Pegasus Group on behalf of Willis Dawson Ltd. (land south and west of Newton Leys)
9. Kirkby Diamond on behalf of landowners (land southwest of Leighton Road)
10. RPS Group on behalf of Richborough (Chadwell Farm and land west of Stoke Road and east of Drayton Road)
11. Stephen Clarke (Moat Farm)

2.2 Other statutory bodies were consulted but none have made representations. The representations from Natural England (2), Historic England (3) and Peter Kenneth Morgan (7) raised no specific issues on the SHNP.

3. Analysis

3.1 This note focuses only on suggested modifications of greater substance as all those of minor consequence, including wording changes, can be addressed in finalising the document.

General Comments

3.2 BC (1) have commented that the arrangement of the inset policies maps makes it difficult to see the true site boundaries. It is therefore recommended that the policies maps are revised to better illustrate the site boundaries

3.2 Pegasus Group (8) have made a number of comments on the (SEA) Environmental Assessment in relation to its assessment of the sites. It is therefore recommended that these comments are passed on to AECOM to consider.

3.3 Stephen Clarke (11) has commented that the SHNP should set out a list of priorities for S106 fund allocation within the parish. It is therefore recommended that the Parish Council (PC) consider adding a list of such priorities to §6.3.

SH1 (Settlement Boundaries)

3.4 BC (1) questions why the existing building curtilages northwest of Church Road and Old School Lane have not been included in the Settlement Boundary. When drawing the settlement boundary, it was considered that the buildings in question were mainly of agricultural use and therefore not appropriate to include within the Settlement Boundary. BC (1) also comment that there are areas of new development, or which have been granted planning permission which are currently excluded from the Settlement Boundary. It is therefore recommended that the Settlement Boundary is reconsidered, particularly to the northwest edge of Stoke Hammond village and revised to include more recent developments.

3.5 BC (1) requests that an explanation is added to explain the methodology for drawing the Settlement Boundary. It is therefore recommended that an explanation of the process is added after §5.4 in the supporting text of SH1.

3.6 RPS Group (10) has suggested that the settlement boundary currently drawn around the south end of Newton Leys should be removed, leaving only the settlement boundary around the village of Stoke Hammond. The re-drawing of the boundary is considered necessary to accommodate the NP01 site allocation.

SH2 (Design Code)

3.7 BC (1) queries whether the design code has had regard to the Aylesbury Vale area Design SPD adopted in 2023. It is therefore recommended that reference to the SPD is added to the design code.

3.8 BFSTC (6) state they are unclear as to how the design code relates to the area of Newton Leys. The decision was taken to focus the scope of the design code around the village of Stoke Hammond. It was considered that design coding for the village of Stoke Hammond would add the greatest value as the current development of Newton Leys was developed in accordance with its own design code.

SH3 (Local Heritage Assets)

3.9 Stephen Clarke (11) suggests that the ancient “mote” farm site in the northeast corner of the Moat Farm field should be considered as an addition to the list of Local Heritage Assets in the SHNP. It is therefore recommended that the PC approach Mr. Clarke for more information before deciding whether or not to include it.

SH4 (Green Infrastructure)

3.10 BC (1) considers that the SHNP does not make clear the value of Mount Pleasant Green in respect of its designation of a Local Green Space. It is therefore recommended that further wording is added to §5.12 to explicitly state how Mount Pleasant Green is demonstrably special to the local community, to satisfy the criteria for Local Green Space designation.

3.11 Pegasus Group (8) has commented on the wording of Clause B of SH4, stating that the intention of this policy is not clear. The purpose of this policy is to require applicants to acknowledge, understand and respond to the presence of this network in the design of their proposals if they lie within or adjoining the network. Pegasus Group (8) may have misinterpreted the policy as requiring biodiversity net gains in excess of the 10% statutory requirement. This is not the intention of the policy, rather by identifying the existing green infrastructure assets in the parish, it is hoped that applicants may improve existing parts of the network as part of their biodiversity net gain obligations.

3.12 Stephen Clarke (11) comments that the playing field land with the playground facilities associated with the Community Centre have been omitted from the Green Infrastructure Network. The reason the playing fields and playground facilities were not included in the Green Infrastructure Network is that they fall within the development boundary of Site NP04 of Policy SH9. He also considers the SHNP is silent on the importance of the recreational cluster in Bragenham Side. It should be noted that the SHNP currently acknowledges this asset as a green infrastructure element in Appendix C and also designates it as a community asset.

SH5 (Sustainable Travel)

3.13 Stephen Clarke (11) comments the SHNP could do more to enhance cycling and pedestrian opportunities by rewilding Leighton Road and rerouting the national cycle path through the village, as has been previously proposed. The policy wording of SH5 already encourages development proposals to enhance the functionality of the Sustainable Travel Network where practicable and requires financial contribution to improving or creating new routes.

SH6 (Housing Mix)

3.14 Pegasus Group (8) have suggested that future housing delivery should not be restricted to select size categories (2 and 3 bedroom properties). As is set out in the policy wording of SH6, new developments should provide a 'high proportion' of semi-detached 2 and 3 bedroom dwellings. As such, the policy and Housing Needs Assessment on which it is based, are not advocating for exclusively smaller dwellings, but rather a mix which is balanced towards smaller dwellings to address local housing needs which are not being met by the existing stock of housing in the parish.

3.15 Pegasus Group (8) and RPS Group (10) have commented that the 25% provision of new homes to be built as appropriate for occupation by the elderly persons and/or first-time buyers and those on low incomes is not justifiable. This number was arrived at after considering the findings of the Housing Needs Assessment including that *'the parish (is) a challenging area for local people to get onto the property ladder'*, *'some residents (said) that their children could not afford housing in the village'* and *'it is considered that Stoke Hammond is, in broad terms, a suitable location for specialist accommodation on the basis of the accessibility criteria and*

the considerations of cost effectiveness'. In light of this, the 25% level of provision is considered appropriate.

SH7 (Passivhaus)

3.16 Pegasus Group (8) and RPS Group (10) raise a number of concerns around this policy, including the risk that it does not meet the basic conditions by setting its own standards. It is therefore recommended that the policy wording is revised to place greater emphasis on addressing the 'performance gap' of new developments and clarifying that the policy should not be interpreted as requiring Passivhaus or equivalent standards, but rather acting as an incentive.

SH8 (Traffic Management)

3.17 BC (1) comment that the provisions of Clause C of SH8 to match increases in bedrooms, as a result of extensions, with a net increase in the number of car parking spaces is unlikely to be feasible in terms of space. Pegasus Group (8) make a similar comment in stating that the provisions of Clause C of SH8 are in conflict with VALP Policy T6. It is recommended that this is given further consideration.

3.18 BC (1) comment that parking considerations should also take into account provision for sustainable travel, such as cycle racks and EV charging points. The provision of EV charging points through new development is now covered by building regulations and as such, is not within the scope of the SHNP to cover. However, it should be noted that the provision of publicly available charging points is encouraged in the supporting text of SH8.

3.19 BFSTC (6) comment that they would like to see improved connectivity between Stoke Hammond, Newton Leys and Bletchley and Fenny Stratford. The SHNP is not able to address cross-boundary connectivity issues that extend outside the parish boundary.

SH9 (Site Allocations)

3.20 BC (1) considers that site allocation NP01 would be harmful to the built character of the area and likely have a harmful landscape and visual impact, citing the 2017 VALP HELAA. The assessment carried out by BC was likely done at a much higher level due to its covering of the whole of the Value of Aylesbury. The smaller area covered by the SHNP has meant a detailed site assessment could be carried out. The output of the technical assessment provided by the SEA states that NP01 *'is unlikely to bring forward significant negative effects for landscape character and distinctiveness'* and *'will likely bring forward benefits for landscape, as it will provide visual breaks between developed areas, which will help retain the character of the area'*. It therefore remains a suitable site allocation in the SHNP.

3.21 BC (1) points to two recent planning applications in their representation. For application 23/01533/AOP (Meadowbrook), the PC objects due to concerns around surface water drainage, noise and comments from Thames Valley Police around the need for surveillance due to the proposed site layout. For application 23/01532/AOP (Orchard End), the PC objects due to concerns around biodiversity, open space provision and surface water drainage.

3.22 MKCC (4) comments that site allocation NP01 is silent on infrastructure implications/requirements, access arrangements and any other site-specific requirements. The policy wording of SH9 and its supporting text set out the expectations of the allocation to provide sports fields and green space provision. More site-specific details like access arrangements will be addressed at the planning application stage through design and access statements.

3.23 Both MKCC (4) and NLPC (5) question the rationale for allocating a site for 80 dwellings, citing the fact that there is no current requirement for additional development that is not already allocated within the adopted Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan within the Stoke Hammond. Whilst the statement about the VALP is true, BC is currently in the early stages of preparing its emerging local plan and has not provided the SHNP with an indicative housing requirement. Whilst there is no current housing target, the SHNP recognises the potential for the parish to be the target of future housing growth as part of the emerging BC Local Plan, particularly given its location outside of the Green Belt. Pegasus Group (8) has suggested that the policy wording on the NP01 site criteria of SH9 be modified to deliver 'approximately', rather than 'up to' 80 residential dwellings. It is therefore recommended that the policy wording of SH9 is updated to reflect Pegasus Group's (8) comments.

3.24 MKCC (4) considers that the low density proposed on NP01 would be inappropriate. As set out in the supporting text of SH9, the community support for this site allocation was dependent on a low density approach which was shielded from the existing housing overlooking the site alongside the provision of green space and recreational facilities.

3.25 Both MKCC (4) and Pegasus Group (8) have criticised the housing mix set out in the site-specific requirements for NP01. As discussed in §3.16 above, it should be made clear that Policy SH6 advocates for a high proportion of semi-detached, 2 and 3 bedroom dwellings but still allows for a wider mix of dwelling sizes. The current wording of Policy SH9 suggests that only two-storey, two and three bedroomed semi-detached houses will be permitted. It is therefore recommended that the wording of SH9 is modified to require 'a majority of two-storey, two and three bedroom...'

3.26 MKCC (4) has commented that it is wrong to state that the sports fields and accommodation is to be for the benefit of residents of Newton Leys South and that it should be to the benefit of all residents. The intention of this policy wording is not to exclude those outside of Newton Leys South, but rather to recognise that the current provision of sports facilities in Newton Leys is heavily skewed towards the north. The provision of new sports facilities through the development of Site NP01 would directly benefit those who live in Newton Leys South who are currently some distance away from the existing Newton Leys sports facilities.

3.27 Pegasus Group (8) have suggested a number of amendments to the policy wording of SH9 including the expectation that land for the sports facilities and associated infrastructure will be transferred to the PC. Pegasus Group (8) also suggest that the policy wording on Landscape and Visual Assessments should be removed as they are already required by Buckinghamshire Council in the Validation checklist for planning applications. It is therefore recommended that the suggested wording on the transfer of sports facilities to the PC is incorporated and the wording on Landscape and Visual Assessments is removed.

3.28 MKCC (4) comments that Site NP01 should seek to better integrate with the existing Newton Leys development, rather than creating a buffer as is set out in the supporting text of Policy SH9. The delivery of a 10m tree boundary acting as a buffer between the existing Newton Leys development and Site NP01 was vital for gaining the support of the local community in Stoke Hammond. The development of the site would encroach into rural farmland so the buffer acts as a mitigation to landscape impacts and reflect the semi-rural nature of the site.

3.29 Kirby Diamond (9) comments that the land Southwest of Leighton Road, identified as Site 10 in the SEA, was unfairly discounted. It is therefore recommended that these comments are passed on to AECOM who produced the SEA, for further consideration.

3.30 RPS Group (10) comment that Chadwell Farm and the land to the West of Stoke Road should be considered for allocation in the SHNP. The Call for Sites Submission Statement submitted to BC in September 2022 states that the site could deliver 1,700 dwellings. This level of development is well outside the scope of the SHNP and a site of this site would need to be considered by BC in the production of their emerging local plan.

SH10 (Community Assets)

3.31 BC (1) has suggested that for the policy to be in line with VALP Policy I3, where redevelopment of an existing community facility is proposed the benefits referred to in Clause B of SH10 should be an equivalent or better provision in quality or quantity of provision. It is therefore recommended that this extra clarification is added to the supporting text of SH10.

4. Conclusions & Recommendations

4.1 The representations suggest that further clarification and detail is required. However, it is considered that only minor modifications will be necessary to improve the clarity and application of policy wording. Once the modifications from this report have been made, it is recommended that the SHNP can proceed to the Regulation 15 submission stage without further consultations.

4.2 However, BC has recently been able to resource meetings with NP teams prior to submission to review how its comments have been handled. It is therefore recommended that the PC seeks to arrange such a meeting if within a reasonable timescale.

APPENDIX G

Action Points from the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group meeting held on the 25th April 2024

Attendance

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

Unable to attend.

Tracy Youngs
Nick Ellins
Andy Gardner
Michaela Gardner
Craig Champion

1. Introduction

Malcolm provided an update on progress with the Neighbourhood Plan

- Malcolm explained that we had now received full funding from the Government, and this would be sufficient to get the work necessary completed up to submission to the Bucks Council.
- The Pre-Sub Reg 14 Consultation period ended on the 11th April.
- 38 residents submitted comments, 4 owners and 5 Statutory consultees.
- Of the residents 12 were happy with the plan in its entirety, 19 were happy with the Plan with a few reservations and 7 were unhappy with the plan. Of the 7, 6 were unhappy with the inclusion of the Parish Council Land and 1 with the inclusion of the Newton Leys site.
- A full summary of all the comments is attached at Annex A.
- O'Neill Homer have reviewed the statutory consultee comments and made recommendations for consideration of the Steering Group at this meeting. Annex B
- Neil outlined the process going forward.
 - O'NeillHomer will check the final Plan following any consultation amends against the basic conditions and produce a statement.
 - The Plan, SEA and Basic conditions statement will be sent to Bucks Council for their review.

- Bucks will issue for a further 6-week Reg 16 consultation. This will be notified to statutory consultees and to every resident who responded to the Reg 14 consultation.
- Any feedback will be used to make any further adjustments to the final plan.
- The plan is then passed to an external examiner.
- Once the examiner confirms his acceptance of the plan it is then issued for a Referendum of Stoke Hammond and Newton Leys Parishioners. A 50% acceptance will see it added to the Aylesbury Vale Local Plan as an official planning document specific to the parish.

2. Pre-Sub Policy Review

SH1

- It was agreed the maps needed improving. Neil was happy to perform this task.
- We discussed whether boundaries should be created around outlying areas outside the two main conurbations. Neil said this was not normally done.
- The apparent anomalies of having Grove Farm and the Church outside the boundary was discussed. Neil again explained that this had been done in line with normal conventions. The Church by its nature would not be included in any future proposed developments.
- It was suggested that there should be reference to Willowbridge Marina and the Stoke Road properties. Neil said this could be included in section 2.

SH 2

- We discussed the suggestion that there should be specific restrictions for Dorma Windows in Character areas A and D. This had been specifically linked to being overlooked. Neil said that the Local Plan already had specific requirements in respect of being overlooked and the Design Code already said that 3 Storey houses should not be allowed.
- A request had been made for consideration of the Stoke Road Properties. Neil felt this was unnecessary as the wording on design outside of the designated boundaries provided protection for Rural and Countryside sites.

SH 3

- Stephen Clarke had suggested that Moat Farm had a 13th Century dwelling in the NE corner of Moat Farm field. Eileen had found no record of this in her search and Neil thought this was odd, as a building of that age would have been recorded by Historic England. Malcolm to investigate with Stephen on the evidence to support his statement. **Action: Malcolm N**

SH 4

- Bucks CC in their feedback requested more information on why the MP Green was 'cherished'. Malcolm explained the recent history and the outcome of the Village Green application. Neil said this was already in the document was there anything else which could be added. Malcolm said that the Green was the last available green space that was available for recreational purposes as originally defined in the 1995 planning application, whilst this was historically used by MP residents no physical barriers or verbal barriers were presented to prevent communal village

use. The recent Brook Farm decision by the North Planning committee had refused the application specifically because it was felt that there was a shortage of available green space North of the Leighton Road within the Village. Neil recommended these comments be added to the Plan. **Action: Malcolm N**

SH5

- The policy already encourages development proposals to enhance the Sustainable Travel Network where possible and asks for financial contribution to improving or creating new routes. Some of the suggestions put forward by Parishioners could be included in other plans area for inclusion in a more detailed future Parish Plan. **Action: Malcolm N**

SH6

- There were no comments on this section from residents which is perhaps not surprising as it the policy reflected the feedback received from residents on each occasion in the past they have been asked to comment. In addition, it was supported by an independent HNA.

SH7

- This policy area was challenged by Pegasus Group who felt it did not meet the basic conditions and was setting its own standards. Neil said many NP do not include a policy of this type. He suggested he could make it more palatable by changing the wording requesting new developments address the performance gap that currently exists, and that the policy should be interpreted as an incentive to higher standards rather than achieving a specific standard.
- After discussion the group agreed unanimously, they wanted a policy and would be happy with Neil's redraft. **Action Neil H**

SH8

- Pegasus Group made comments with respect to increased parking provision related to bedroom extensions was unlikely to be feasible in terms of space and they also stated that the provisions of clause C of SH8 conflicts with VALP policy T6. It is recommended by Neil we review both issues. **Action: Greg N**
- Bletchley and Fenny Town Council would like to see improved connectivity between Stoke Hammond, Newton Leys and Bletchley, Fenny Stratford, whilst this is commendable the SHNP is not able to address cross boundary connectivity issues that extend outside the boundary.

SH9

NP01 Land South of Newton Leys

- BC comments against this development were discussed but Neil's view was that the site remains suitable for site allocation.
- Pegasus Group are generally supportive of the plan but have requested the limit of 80 houses should be changed to approximate. Malcolm suggested this was a bit vague and would discuss with Craig outside of the meeting. **Action: Malcolm N/Craig C.**
- Pegasus also queried the need for a Landscape and Visual assessment suggesting it be removed as it was already covered by the AVDC Local Plan. They also suggested the transfer of the Sports facilities would be transferred to the PC and this should be recorded. Malcolm said he would discuss this with Craig and his PC colleagues. **Action: Malcolm N**
- Pegasus and MKCC both criticised the Housing Mix set out. The wording of SHP suggests only 2 storey 2 and 3 bedroom semi detached houses will be permitted. Neil recommended that the wording is modified to 'require a majority of two storey 2- and 3-bedroom houses. The Steering Group agreed as this was in keeping with the SH6 Housing Mix Policy. **Action: Malcolm N**
- NLPC and MKC also objected on the grounds that there was no need for additional provision within SHP area in the AVDC Local Plan. This is true but the driving force behind recommending this site is the residents needs for improved facilities and recreational space. The development is acceptable to residents based on the consultation and should therefore go ahead if the Steering Group agree. In addition, the Steering Group are acutely aware that Bucks are developing a longer-term Local Plan. After a short discussion the group confirmed its inclusion.

NP02 Land North of Harrods Close and NP05 Orchard End and Meadowside

- Both these sites were currently subject to planning applications to which the PC has objected. It is recognized however that both sites are likely to be developed in the future and it was sensible to include them in the NP. Hopefully if the current applications are refused then any new applications will be subject to the NP as made.
- The group were in favour of retaining the sites. (Note: Since the meeting I have received a positive response from the landowner wanting to work with the Steering Group/Parish Council)

NP03 land East of Fenny

- This site received no objections from the residents and we have had positive contact from the landowner. Steering Group confirmed its retention in the plan.

NP04 Parish Council Land

- From a resident's perspective inclusion of the Parish Council land is the most contentious. There were 10 objections received most of which offered no reasons other than they were opposed. This to be viewed against the 25 people who put this site as their first choice at the prioritization in March 2023.
- Neil asked why there hadn't been a representation from the Community Association. This led to a discussion where Greg confirmed that if the Community association had provided a view they would have voted against as he himself has at SG meetings. Neil asked for his reason in opposing the inclusion of this site and he responded he didn't think it appropriate.
- Neil asked if the proposal was understood by the local community. Eileen and Dave both said they felt it was not understood. Both the PC and the NP Plan have made it clear that no

development would be considered unless there was net benefit in terms of facilities and space for the Community.

- One concern being expressed was that the Playground would be lost in the process of development. Malcolm suggested that this would obviously not be the case, it would move, and this could be planned prior to development. Greg suggested that this is not what is shown in the plan. It was agreed adding this clarity would help.
- Neil suggested that perhaps a specific communication exercise would be a good thing to do specifically explaining what is being suggested and the benefits of this to the wider community.
- Neil also suggested that a presentation to the Steering Group and PC by the Almshouse Association might provide a positive view on the benefits this could bring to the Community.
- The Steering Group were asked whether they wanted to retain the PC land in the NP, and this was agreed by 5 votes to 1.

SH10 Community Assets

- Most of the comments relating to this Policy were asking for greater clarity on the vision for growing our community resources. It would have been good to be more specific on this topic area, but it has been outside the scope of the NP given the sheer size of the issue. The Parish Council have vested responsibility for this with Craig Champion and the S106 project.

3. Other

- A few issues raised relate to infrastructure improvements that require analysis and may possibly be areas that could benefit from S106 agreements as well as being included in a broad-based Parish Plan. We will capture these, so they are not lost in the other non-planning matters section.
- Neil agreed to produce a snagging list outlining responsibilities going forward. **Action: Neil H. (Attached at Annex C)**
- It was proposed that all the necessary work be completed in time for final parish Council sign off at the 2nd of June PC meeting.

4. Date of the next meeting to be notified later.

Malcolm Newing