

Stewkley Neighbourhood Plan – online responses

Organisation - Not Answered

Name - Camilla Boyd

Request to be notified of future progress of the neighbourhood plan - Yes

Support or object to neighbourhood Plan - I support the submitted Neighbourhood Plan but do not wish to make any comments or suggest changes

Comments suggested changes and reasons - Not Answered

Ref - ANON-BP5Z-CR4T-X

Stewkley Neighbourhood Plan – online responses

Organisation - Not Answered

Name - Geoffrey Ring

Request to be notified of future progress of the neighbourhood plan - Yes

Support or object to neighbourhood Plan - I object to the submitted Neighbourhood Plan and will provide comments to explain my reasons

Comments suggested changes and reasons - COMMENTS ON THE STEWKLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

The opening paragraph of the Stewkley Neighbourhood Plan states that it takes into account views widely expressed by its residents. However, as I will go on to explain, some widely expressed views have not been taken into account. Further more, it would appear that aspects of the plan are deliberately skewed to reflect the desires of a minority.

Section 1.26 refers to the churchyard of St Michaels Church as a “... Green space.”, a key statement as you progress through the plan.

Section 1.44 states that Stewkley is well served by a network of key open spaces. It goes on to state that these key open spaces include heritage sites, and non-recreational green spaces. Here we start to see the links being made with the churchyard of St Michaels Church.

Moving on now to the report of the working group on Conservation and Heritage. This group comprised the two people who were both fundamentally opposed to plans in 2017 to erect a small hall, to be called The Chapter House, in the grounds of St Michaels Church to ensure its future viability. At present the church has no toilets or adequate space for meetings or a Sunday school to benefit future Church generations.

In the section under the heading “Consultation, and Conservation and Heritage Policies” it specifically makes reference to the 5 people (out of a population of over 1800) who:

“..... highlighted historic assets and important buildings not to be damaged by inappropriate building or alterations, and wrote objections with regard to proposed building of St Michael’s Chapter House next to the most precious heritage asset in the village. “

This view is echoed in Section 4 of the report of the Key Open and Green Spaces Group in which it states:

“The churchyard is key to this ‘nationally ‘important building. With many fine examples of mature trees, it houses the graves of many of the existing community’s ancestors including those that have fallen in the two world wars. It creates a beautiful, tranquil setting that is well maintained by the church community. Its importance means that it should remain intact without alteration. “

In Table 10 of the same report it is recommending that:

“St Michael’s (1150 AD) Church + Churchyard”

be designated as Local Green Spaces which, I suggest, is another way of ensuring that the proposals that the church had to ensure its future viability would again be thwarted.

It is also interesting that the list under Section 12.3 of the same report states that as well as “All Heritage spaces” being designated as Local Green Spaces, which would again preclude any development of the churchyard, it also includes the “Recreation Ground” which, only recently the Parish Council supported the erection of a building on this area for use by the Scouts.”

Returning now to the body of the report attention should be drawn to Policy STK8: Community Assets. Here, it does actually give a slight degree of flexibility when it states that:

“Proposals that result in the loss of any of the following community facilities will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that they are no longer viable, as defined by the VALP

- I. St Michael’s Church
- II. Stewkley Methodist Chapel and Hall
- III. St Michael’s C of E Combined School
- IV. Village Hall
- V. Recreation Ground and Pavilion
- VI. The Swan Public House
- VII. The Carpenter Arms Public House

Proposal to improve a community facility by way of physical improvements, extension or redevelopment will only be supported if it can be demonstrated that the benefits will enhance its community value and will not undermine the viability of an existing facility.

Proposals for new or replacement community facilities will only be supported if clear evidence can be provided of an unmet need that cannot be met through extensions to or redevelopment of an existing community”

However, I do not feel this level of flexibility overrides the views expressed elsewhere in the report, which specifically oppose the possibility of any future buildings within the church grounds.

Whilst I appreciate the special nature of this area, the need for the proposed building was carefully considered by the highest authority on Historic Building issues which stated:

“Historic England has been in discussions with the Parish regarding the provision of improved facilities at the church for some time. In our letter of 9 April 2015 we accepted the principle of a detached ‘chapter house’ to the north of the church. The current proposals develop this concept with a separate building standing to the north of the church and set at a slight angle to it. In our view the distance between the two would be sufficient to allow an appreciation of the architectural qualities of the Norman building, particularly in views from the west. While we think that being able to appreciate this building as one of the few remaining un-enlarged 12th century churches is an important aspect of its significance we do not hold that its architectural qualities are dependent of it appearing completely alone in the church-yard and that no other buildings should be visible.”

When the final planning application was made the Chief Planning Officer’s recommendation was for approval, stating that the effect on the setting was outweighed by the benefits to the community. It was only when it was presented to the elected members was it refused. Advice from consultants was to launch an appeal but this was not taken up due to the lack of church funding for such action.

At a future time it may well be that others develop this idea again and the proposal is resurrected. At such time it would be sad if it were to fail again due to a Neighbourhood Plan, which had been adopted without the appreciation that in part it was worded to thwart such a scheme.

I would recommend that the Plan be returned to the Parish Council for further consideration of the issues raised in the above comments.

Geoffrey N Ring

25th November, 2020

Ref - ANON-BP5Z-CR4K-N

Stewkley Neighbourhood Plan – online responses

Organisation - Anglian Water Services Ltd

Name - Stewart Patience

Request to be notified of future progress of the neighbourhood plan - Yes

Support or object to neighbourhood Plan - I support the submitted Neighbourhood Plan and would like to provide comments or suggest changes

Comments suggested changes and reasons - Policy STK1: Settlement Boundary

Reference is made to development being permitted in the designated countryside where it is for housing exception scheme or other uses suited to a countryside location including leisure, recreation and community right to build.,

Anglian Water's existing infrastructure is often located in the countryside at a distance from built up areas.

We had previously asked that the infrastructure provided by Anglian Water for our customers is an exceptional use for the purposes of this policy as set out in our previous representations on the Neighbourhood Plan.

However, we note that uses considered to be acceptable in the countryside does not include reference to infrastructure provision. Anglian Water's existing infrastructure is often located in the countryside at a distance from built up areas.

It is therefore proposed that Policy STK1 be amended as follows:

Development proposals on land outside the defined Settlement Boundary will not be supported other than for rural housing exception schemes, uses that are suited to a countryside location such as appropriate leisure and recreational uses, or community right to build schemes[, or utility infrastructure.] [new text]

Ref - ANON-BP5Z-CR4D-E

Stewkley Neighbourhood Plan – online responses

Organisation - Village Foundations

Name - Nick Wyke

Request to be notified of future progress of the neighbourhood plan - Yes

Support or object to neighbourhood Plan - I support the submitted Neighbourhood Plan and would like to provide comments or suggest changes

Comments suggested changes and reasons - We support the work of the neighbourhood plan group and the allocation of the site Wing Road, East (NP07) Land below No.3 Wing Road in the neighbourhood plan. The site can deliver 15 dwellings in a mix of 2,3 and 4 bed dwellings and will include the provision of 4 affordable dwellings.

Paragraph 4.21

Paragraph 4.21 of the draft neighbourhood plan refers to the need for new housing coming forward to be first offered to Parish residents or direct members of their families.

As part of the sale of properties there will be opportunities for members of the public to express an interest and purchase the dwellings being constructed. Whilst we understand the aim of this policy is to ensure local housing needs are met, we feel it is overly restrictive. It risks the dwellings not being occupied at the time of completion should a suitable occupier not be found in time.

Consequently, we would recommend that the wording of paragraph 4.21 is removed.

If this requirement is to remain in the neighbourhood plan we would recommend that a time limit of no more than 3 months is placed on the marketing to Parish residents or direct members of their families and it is restricted to the two bed dwellings.

Policy STK3: Housing Allocations.

Policy STK3 requires site NP07 to be served by a new (single) service road and pedestrian access/egress off the road at the northern end of the site.

In response, the access point off Wing will need to be placed where it meets the required highway safety visibility splays. Should a further pedestrian access point be required at the northern part of the site any loss of hedgerow can be off-set through new planting within the site. We would suggest the policy is re-worded as follows:

“Where required a new vehicle service road and pedestrian access/egress shall be created off Wing Road in a way that minimises the loss of the existing hedge for sight lines. Any loss of hedgerow should be off-set through new planting within the site”

Policy STK3 requires the building to comprise 2 single storey dwellings and around 13 dwellings up to 2 storey.

Whilst we understand there is a need for downsizer bungalow homes, Policy H6c 'Accessibility' of the draft Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP) already requires all new development to be meet and maintain high standards of accessibility and meet at least category 2 accessible and adaptable dwellings standards.

These standards are similar to life-time home standards and ensure the dwellings are accessible to most people and able to suit older people, those with reduced mobility and some wheelchair users.

Any planning application submitted would need to accord with the adopted neighbourhood plan and when adopted the draft VALP. The dwellings constructed will therefore be suitable to downsizers. There is not therefore a need for policy STK3 to require the provision of single storey dwellings and we would recommend that this requirement is removed from policy STK3.

Policy STK3 requires the palette of building materials including Stewkley red bricks or similar approved by the Parish Council. Details are already contained in policy STK4 of the Neighbourhood Plan on building materials that have been approved by the Parish Council. Any proposed development would need to accord with the requirements of policy STK4. Whilst we would be happy to consult the Parish Council on the proposed materials, we do not feel the requirement for these to be approved by the Parish Council is necessary and the final decision should be left to the local planning authority. We therefore recommend that reference to Parish Council is removed from policy STK3.

Policy STK3 requires a new village gateway (complementing and design and built with the development on the west of the Wing Road) shall be created utilising the new houses and landscape.

We do not feel that this requirement is effective (Paragraph 35 of the NPPF) as although the site to the west of Wing Road is allocated in the draft neighbourhood plan there is no guarantee that it will come forward for development.

We therefore recommend that the wording of policy STK3 is reworded as follows

“On the south of the site, a new village gateway that is in keeping with this part of the village is created utilising the new houses and landscape”.

Policy STK4: Village Character.

Policy STK4: Village Character states development proposals should also have full regard to the following design features and to supplementary guidance in the Stewkley Conservation Area Appraisal.

The words 'where required' should be added to policy STK4 in order to allow for a degree of flexibility. A condition is likely to be attached to any planning consent requiring details of the materials to be used. This will provide a control mechanism to ensure materials are in keeping with the conservation area and the built form of the village.

Policy STK4 would read as follows:

“Development proposals should where required have full regard to the following design features and to the supplementary guidance in the Stewkley Conservation Area Appraisal”.

Policy STK6: Car Parking.

The requirement for 0.5 car parking spaces per new home for visitor car parking above that required by local authority requirements risks having a scheme that is dominated by parking, losing the undeveloped rural feel of the village.

As the Bucks 2015 Parking Standards already make an allowance for visitor car parking the additional requirement for visitor car parking is not considered necessary.

We therefore advise that the requirement for an additional 0.5 car parking spaces per new home for visitor parking above local authority requirements is removed from policy STK6.

Ref - ANON-BP5Z-CR4M-Q

Stewkley Neighbourhood Plan – online responses

Organisation - Not Answered

Name - yvonne millward

Request to be notified of future progress of the neighbourhood plan - Yes

Support or object to neighbourhood Plan - I support the submitted Neighbourhood Plan and would like to provide comments or suggest changes

Comments suggested changes and reasons - Having been a resident for over 26 years, I have noticed the alarming increase of volume and speed of traffic. With the imminent development along the Soulbury Road, traffic volume will increase further. I live right on the road on High Street North, by a bend. There are no traffic calming measures here whatsoever. We have had our own vehicle written off by a school coach driver (the police, despite witnesses, were not bothered to prosecute) a friend's car and an unknown driver smashed into the telegraph pole which left fragments of his vehicle on my property. No organisation appears to be bothered at all by this scenerio. Utterly unacceptable. When is the local authority going to address speeding in this section of the village? They can't even be bothered to fix speed and counting traffic cables on the corner by Bowls Farm. Why? All residents pay local authority rates. It would appear that villages are not regarded as important as larger towns. Why? Let's get some action and soon! By this I mean, not the occasional police van speed monitoring presence but an actual and permanent traffic calming/island along this section of High Street North. The speeding situation is appalling. 30mph? I believe the majority of motorists passing my door suffer with dyscalculia.

Ref - ANON-BP5Z-CR4P-T