

Marsh Gibbon Neighbourhood Development Plan

Consultation Statement

Reg.15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012

Approved by MGPC
10/06/2014

Contents

<i>Subject</i>	<i>Page</i>
1. Scope	2
2. Parish Plan 2011	2
3. Housing Consultation 2011	3
4. Neighbourhood Plan (2012-13)	5
5. Public Consultation 2013-14	5
6. Housing Needs Survey 2014	8
7. Pre-submission Consultation 2014	8
8. Schedule of Consultation Events	10
Addendum: Parish Plan Consultation	11
Appendices	
1. Public Meeting Q & A	13
2. Feedback from Public Meeting	16
3. Analysis of Questionnaire Responses	18
4. Pre-Submission Consultees	31

Consultation Statement

Marsh Gibbon Neighbourhood Development Plan

in accordance with Reg.15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012

Scope

1. This statement summarises the consultation procedures undertaken by Marsh Gibbon Parish Council for the Marsh Gibbon Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 requires Marsh Gibbon Parish Council to produce this Consultation Statement and submit it alongside the Marsh Gibbon Neighbourhood Development Plan. Regulation 15 states that a consultation statement is a document which:

- contains details of the persons and bodies who have been consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan
- explains how they were consulted
- summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
- describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

Background

2. Parish Plan 2011

Marsh Gibbon Parish Council (MGPC) adopted the community-led plan 'Marsh Gibbon – Our Future' on March 8th 2011. It had been produced by a group of over 20 volunteers over the previous 18 months, based on extensive consultation with the village. The Plan 'Marsh Gibbon – Our Future' identified a wide range of community priorities and objectives. As shown below, a number of these related to future housing development in the village, employment opportunities, car parking, environmental quality and community uses. The Plan included a specific objective to produce a neighbourhood plan:

Issue identified	Action required
Broadband is slow in village	Faster Access
Provide homes to meet local need	Facilitate more Affordable Homes for young families
Growing need for elderly accommodation	Facilitate more Affordable Homes for the elderly
Lack of employment opportunities	Protect and ensure jobs for local people
Congestion in surrounding area from drop-off parking by School parents	Make Parking provision for expanded School
Environment under potential threat	Safeguard the attractive village features
Housing, Employment and Community Use of land in village	Prepare land-use plan

The land-use related priorities and objectives identified in the parish plan, 'Marsh Gibbon – Our Future' provided a clear context for the future development of the Neighbourhood Plan.

MGPC set up a Parish Plan Action Committee (PAC) to implement the plan over the next five years, comprising five councillors and two co-opted volunteer members from the plan steering group. This Committee then took on the role in 2012 of producing a Neighbourhood Development Plan.

3. Housing Consultation 2011

Another important starting point for the development of the Neighbourhood Plan was the village's input provided during a consultation exercise held in 2011 on future development in the village.

MGPC responded to Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC)'s invitation in 2011 to contribute the village's views on future development for the then emerging Vale of Aylesbury Plan (VAP), now withdrawn. A questionnaire summarising the key housing, environmental and employment issues was delivered by PAC members to every home and business in the parish in November. The consultation was also available on MGPC's website. Responses were collected and returned over the next three weeks.

An information stand at the Winter Fayre at the Village Hall on Saturday November 19th enabled the public to consult MGPC members, as well as to complete a questionnaire on the spot. A public meeting took place in the Village Hall on the evening of Monday November 21st to enable people to ask questions and discuss the issues. Attended by 21 people, it lasted for two hours.

95 written or online responses were received, i.e. 24% of the 400 homes and businesses in the parish. The questions asked and the responses were:

Question 1: Any more New Homes?

None: 9 **Some: 84 (21% of the village)**

Question 2: How Many New Homes a year? Responses of the 84 who answered 'Some' to Q.1

Two pa: 24

Four pa: 37

Six pa: 17

Eight pa: 3 **Average: Four a year**

Question 3: Type of housing (86 respondents, some of whom ticked more than one box)

Social/for young people: 24

For older people: 16

Private development: 7

Mixed approach: 61.

A majority favoured the mixed approach and many specified for young and older people.

Questions 4a/b: Where to build and where not

The answers to these questions were various and often self-cancelling. For example, 20 people wanted infill and 14 did not; 18 suggested to build on the edges of the village and 12 said not there; 13 said do not build in the fields, while another 13 said that was the place to build.

Ewelme Trust's response nominated five sites for potential development. Respondents generally nominated some of those sites and others.

The highest support for any point was that 23 people said not to build in the Conservation Areas.

Question 5a: How Many Jobs per New Home?

This question was answered by 55 respondents.

One per home: 28

Two per home: 27

Average: 1.5 jobs per home

Question 5b: What type of Jobs?

Varied: 14

Light industry: 13

Working from home: 8

Service sector: 7

Trades: 6

Rural: 6.

Question 6: What Facilities are needed?

The answers generally confirmed the priorities set out in the Parish Plan:

Improved Post Office and Shop: 49

Leisure, play, fitness: 15

Better public transport: 8

Better car parking: 5 (3 specified School)

School to take Years 5 and 6: 5

Faster broadband: 5

Restaurant/coffee shop: 4

Traffic speed control: 3

Doctor's surgery: 3.

[There were six other single suggestions: a blacksmith, a larger burial ground, sewage/water culverts sorted out, a police station, a hospital, and new footways]

MGPC responded to AVDC's VAP consultation with a report of the above responses.

The agents of Ewelme Trust (a major landowner in the village), proposed to AVDC five sites in the village, two of which were later included by AVDC in its Strategic Housing Land Area Assessment as capable of accommodating 10 or more homes – Swan Field and land at Leopold Farm, Castle Street.

4. Neighbourhood Plan (2012-13)

In 2012 the Parish Council's Plan Action Committee ('PAC') began work on a Neighbourhood Development Plan. As set out in Sections 3 and 4 above, the community objectives in the Parish Plan action plan, together with the community's feedback into the District Council's consultation on future development within the parish, provided the basis for developing the vision, objectives and policies for the Neighbourhood Plan.

All the PAC meetings are public and the minutes are posted on the MGPC website for access by members of the public. The Committee reported to MGPC regularly and full Council minutes were on the website.

On November 27th, the Parish Council applied for designation of the parish as a Neighbourhood Area, which was agreed by AVDC on February 12th 2013. Then the work of drafting and reviewing began, with support from a professional advisor from Planning Aid England, from AVDC's Forward Planners, and with a £4,000 grant from the Community Development Foundation, via Locality.

5. Consulting the Public 2013-14

A draft of the Marsh Gibbon Neighbourhood Development Plan (MGNDP) was produced by October 2013. This draft was widely publicised. We organised a public meeting in the village hall on October 25th 2013 to seek the views of residents on the draft Plan that had been agreed by MGPC in June. An announcement of the meeting was placed in the "Life Together" newsletter, delivered to every home in the village at the end of September. Posters about the meeting were placed on 10 notice boards in the village on October 14th.

The draft Plan was printed on October 19th and a copy delivered to over 400 homes and businesses in the village and surrounding area on Sunday 20th. The plan was accompanied by the letter which again invited all residents to provide input into the plan and attend the forthcoming meeting on October 25th. The Plan and questionnaire were available online on the same day and the online website linked to the MGPC site.

The public meeting was also announced to the audience of 200-plus attending a talk on the history of Marsh Gibbon in the village hall on Sunday 20th.

A copy of the Plan was delivered to the School and the agents for Ewelme Trust were sent a pdf of the Plan, followed by five printed copies as they requested on October 21st.

The meeting was attended by more than 60 people who received a presentation on the subject of Neighbourhood Planning, followed by an overview and review of the policies in MGNDP. Seven work stations were set up around the hall and at the mid-point of the evening people had the opportunity to contribute. Then in a Q&A session many points were raised and answered, recorded by the Clerk [see Appendix 1]. We were congratulated for providing the opportunity to participate by many who attended.

Reports were compiled of the points made at the seven key work stations [see Appendix 2].

Concerns Raised and Plan Response

The issues raised at the public meeting were considered and addressed as follows:

Potential Sites for Development: We are not designating areas for development in MGNDP and so the feedback to the question - whether people could suggest other sites than the five proposed by Ewelme - did not commit us to any action. Rather, the suggested sites simply showed that people were content to see development beyond the current built boundary. No change to draft Plan.

Local Green Spaces: Support for both proposed Local Green Spaces was strong – the majority were in favour of their designation. Of the two sites, support was stronger for Moat Close (95%) than for Swan Field (68%), where a number of suggestions for compromises were effectively negative to designation. No change to draft Plan.

Mix/type of housing: the great majority (83%) agreed with the proposed policy that we support applications that provide homes at the lower end of the size range, suitable for young people and families, and for the elderly. The other six responses were not contrary to this approach. No change to draft Plan.

Where not to build: The results were consistent with the strong backing for Moat Close and Swan Field to be designated as local green spaces. Other nominations were largely self-cancelling by the response to the suggested potential sites question. It is worth noting the comment that larger, edge developments would be better able to include some affordable homes than small infill sites. No change to draft Plan.

Phasing: People saw phasing and larger developments as preferable for very similar reasons. The underlying themes were consistent with the other responses. No change to draft Plan.

Online Response Analysis

The 47 written and online questionnaire responses were analysed and compiled into a report by a specialist company Code Vanilla Ltd, who had conducted the online response [see Appendix 3].

The responses came almost equally from males and females; 50% from the 46-65 age group; 50% from people who shared their home with one other person, 20 % from single occupants, and 30% from households of three to five people.

We reported back by email three times in the following weeks to 27 individuals who had asked to be updated, sending copies of the abovementioned reports.

At meetings of PAC and MGPC we considered all the responses from the public and made some revisions to the draft in the light of these.

A full analysis of the feedback received on the informal draft of the Neighbourhood Plan is in Appendix 3 to this document. A summary of the key points raised at this stage by respondents is provided below.

MGNDP Policy (listed in order of degree of concern)	Key Issue	Analysis and response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● MG11: Providing Parking Spaces (now MG15) ● MG6: Infill Housing Development ● MG1: Development within Conservation Areas ● MG5: Developing on the Boundary ● MG9: Relocation of Businesses (now MG 12) ● MG14: Parking for School (now MG18) ● MG15: Protection of Community Facilities (now MG19) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Wide opposition to on-street parking facilities ● Concern about the freedom to develop on infill sites ● Views range from allowing no development in such areas to very restricted development ● Greater restriction was being called for ● Attracted some disagreement ● Strong feelings about the importance and effectiveness of any solution ● The shop/PO came under heavy criticism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Agreed and supported in draft Plan ● Respondents' lack of understanding of issue: no change to Plan ● Agreed and supported in draft Plan ● Decided that Plan policy was in best interests of village to prevent pressure on centre and open spaces ● Decided that Plan policy was in best interests of village ● Agreed and supported in draft Plan ● Issue not within scope of Plan to address
NB: Policies in the draft Plan were renumbered in subsequent drafts		

In response to the informal consultation with the community in October 2013, the draft Neighbourhood Plan was revised to take into comments relating to car parking provision for new housing. In addition, the plan was amended to take into account the findings of the Inspector during the examination into AVDC's VAP Strategy in January 2014 and the subsequent withdrawal of AVDC's VAP Strategy. [The extant local plan - for MGNDP to be in general conformity with - is the 2004 Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan.]

6. Housing Needs Survey 2014

The need for an up to date Housing Needs Survey to underpin policy in the Neighbourhood Plan, and to ensure effective implementation of policy, was realised by the PAC in October 2013. We received a further £3,000 grant via Locality, from the Community Development Foundation, to meet the majority of the cost of £3,500 for Community Impact Bucks (CIB) to conduct a Housing Needs Survey (HNS) in the village; plus £500 from the Vale of Aylesbury Housing Trust (VAHT).

An item was placed in the December issue of the 'Life Together' newsletter explaining the link between the HNS and MGNDP. Parish councillors delivered 420 CIB questionnaires to every home in the parish in January. Notice was displayed on the MGPC website, together with a link to the questionnaire online. We received 107 responses (25%, which is apparently the norm). CIB's report to MGPC on February 11th is contained in the Evidence Base.

We sent copies of the report as an email attachment to the 27 people on the 'update' list, to the agents for Ewelme Trust, to AVDC and VAHT. It was displayed on the Council's website.

It was then discussed at the meeting of the PAC on February 24th, which recommended the inclusion of the findings into the Evidence Base, the reaffirmation of the MGNDP policies on housing, and the investigation of a Community Land Trust as a potential means to deliver the housing to answer the needs identified. These recommendations were accepted by MGPC at its March meeting.

7. Pre-submission Consultation

[Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012: Reg. 14]

MGPC then launched MGNDP for six weeks of consultation running from January 17th to February 28th. An announcement was displayed on the MGPC website, with a downloadable copy of the Plan, the Evidence Base and information on how and when representations should be made. AVDC also made the same announcement on its website with links to the MGNDP.

Emails announcing the Reg 14 consultation were sent, totalling 69, to statutory consultees, including AVDC and the district and county councillors for Marsh Gibbon; plus the 27 villagers who had asked to be kept informed; and to village organisations such as the executive committee of the Village Hall, the three local churches, the Old Folks Fund Committee, the Scout Group, the School Head-teacher and Chair of Governors. Emails were sent to the owners of the two areas proposed as local green spaces - the chief executive and the agent for Ewelme Trust re Swan Field, and the landowner of the Moat Close field.

Printed copies of the Plan were available at the village shop, in the village hall and at St Mary's Church. Copies were posted to four statutory consultees for whom we had no email contact addresses. The full list is attached as Appendix 4.

Responses with relevant comments were received from: AVDC Forward Plans, BCC Place Service, Ewelme Almshouse Charity (by Dijkman Planning Consultants), Mr Roy Lambourne (a local resident), Marsh Gibbon Old Folks Fund, and from Thames Water (by Savills). Responses from organisations such as Cherwell District Council, Launton Parish Council and Coal Authority did not make any specific comments.

A summary of the key points raised during the Regulation 14 Pre-Submission consultation period is set out in the table below, together with an analysis and, where relevant, resulting changes made to the plan.

Stakeholder	Key Issue	Analysis and response
Aylesbury Vale District Council	Queried ability to implement certain draft policies	Agreed reservations and amended policies
Bucks County Council	Suggested amendment to car parking policy and requested clarification on green spaces	Retained parking policy as no available BCC alternative Green space text revised
Ewelme Trust (Landowner/Charity)	Opposition to local green space designation of Swan Field	Met agents and revised policy
Savills for Thames Water (Utility)	Need policy for water and waste management	Included policy as requested
Marsh Gibbon Old Folks Fund (Charity)	Supportive comments and suggestions	Agreed and incorporated where appropriate

Consultation with Interested Parties

1. Local Green Space designation of Swan Field

Following the response on behalf of Ewelme, the major landowner in the area, we initiated a meeting with its agent and planning consultant, attended by the chairman of MGPC and two other councillors. The meeting discussed the various alternatives available to the charity and to the Council, in order to seek consensus on the best options for the village and to consider whether to amend any of the draft MGNDP before submission to AVDC. Amendments were made to the area designated as Local Green Space in the draft Plan as a result.

2. Marsh Gibbon School

An email exchange also took place between MGPC chairman and the chair of governors of MGS to clarify the School's position following the decision by the Charities Commission that Ewelme would not be able fund building at MGS from the sale of development land. The plan to expand the School is now proceeding with funding from the Oxford Diocese.

3. Local Green Space designation of Moat Close

In June 2014, we were informed of an imminent planning application from the owner of Moat Close to develop new homes and off-road parking in the south of the field. We amended the area to be designated as Local Green Space in the draft Plan to allow for this development.

Environmental Consultees

Aylesbury Vale District Council carried out an SEA screening opinion for the Marsh Gibbon Neighbourhood Development Plan and concluded that it is not likely to have significant environmental effects and therefore does not trigger a need for a Strategic Environmental Assessment. The statutory consultees, Environment Agency, Natural England and English Heritage, were consulted on the screening opinion. They agreed with AVDC's conclusions and their responses can be seen in full the Basic Conditions Statement.

Consultation Events leading to MGNDP

Note: there are c.400 addresses in Marsh Gibbon and almost 800 people on electoral roll

Issue	Event	Date	Numbers	Outcome
Future of Village	Meeting organised by PC	Sept 2009	20 people attended	Volunteers formed Steering Group
	Stand at Xmas Fayre	Nov 2009	23 visitors	Feedback on concerns
	Questionnaire to organisations, school parents, Ferret Racing audience	Jan 2010	145	Seven theme groups set up and drafted plan
	Questionnaire to every household and online	Sept 2010	400 delivered 175 responses	Prioritised key issues. 28 volunteers to help address them.
	MGPC meeting	08/03/2011	400 delivered	Parish Plan adopted and copied to every address. MGPC formed Parish Plan Action Committee
Housing Assessment	"How many new homes here?" questionnaire to all homes, plus online and on PC website	Nov-11	400 delivered	
	Information stand at Winter Fayre	19/11/2011	27 visitors	
	Public Meeting	21/11/2011	21 attended	Assessment sent to AVDC
Neighbourhood Plan	Draft to all homes. On PC website, online, to school, Ewelme, 27 emails	20/10/2013	400 plus (47 responses)	
	Public meeting. Presentation, themed workstations, Q&A	25/10/2013	60+ attended	Refined and amended draft
Housing Needs Survey	Questionnaire to all homes. On PC website, online, to AVDC, Ewelme, 27 emails	Jan-14	400 delivered	Report findings factored into Plan and appended to Evidence Base
Neighbourhood Plan	Pre-submission consultation Printed copies in 3 public locations Downloadable from PC website and AVDC website	17/01/2014 to 28/02/2014	Emailed and posted to 99 consultees, to landowners, village groups, School, etc.	Responses from 3 statutory consultees, local resident, OFF Committee, and the Ewelme Trust planning consultant. Amended policies as necessary.

As a result of the in-depth and extensive consultation that has taken place, together with the adaptation of the draft to input received, we are confident that MGNDP reflects the needs and wishes of the village.

Addendum

Marsh Gibbon Parish Plan Consultation

How did it start?

An initial launch meeting was held in the village hall in September 2009, attended by over 20 people. A Steering Group was formed by volunteers after the meeting and met regularly for 18 months to coordinate activity and discuss ideas.

How You Contributed

The Christmas Fayre in November 2009 was the first occasion when ideas were gathered from people on what they like about life in the village and what they would like to see changed. A questionnaire was then sent out twice to gather further input from members of organisations such as the Old Folks Fund Committee and the Horticultural Society; to parents of children attending Marsh Gibbon; and distributed at the Ferret Racing evening. A progress report was given to the Parish Meeting in April 2010.

Having identified the key areas where people wanted to see change, the Steering Group then set up a series of seven theme groups. These groups totalling another 20 or so people met two or three times each to look into the issues in more detail. Their recommendations were contained in the Draft Plan circulated in the village in Autumn 2010.

One of the most important factors in community-led planning is that as many people as possible participate. We designed and printed 500 questionnaires and delivered one to every household. An online version was also created and we used 'Life Together' to remind everyone to complete the survey.

The full Draft Plan was designed, printed and distributed to over 50 people (parish councillors, organisation secretaries, etc). Response boxes with spare forms and Plans were placed in the Village Shop, St Mary's Church, The Greyhound, The Plough and the Village Hall.

Consultation Response

175 people responded, representing about half of all households in the village. Most people (130) used the printed questionnaires - only a quarter went online (45). The main return point for questionnaires was at the Shop, where 63 were returned. Of all the respondents, 96% live in the village and 30% work here – others work elsewhere or do not work.

Key Issues

We asked you to tell us the importance of three issues in seven areas.

The results follow in the order of importance you said:

Shop/Post Office

Speed Reduction

Land Use Plan

Prescription Collection

Neighbourhood Watch

Jobs in the Village

Assess Housing Needs

Better Bus Service

Protect Water Meadows

Shared Equity Housing

Footpath at West Edge

Village Newsletter

More Dog bins

Ware Pond weeds

School to extend

Website for village

All Weather Pitch

Footpath map

Play Equipment

Business Forum

Local Gym.

Additional Issues

We invited people to make extra comments and received many – some raising new points; 322 comments from over 110 respondents. Although the option was there to be anonymous, 33 people did identify themselves at the end of their questionnaire. 28 people volunteered to help on one or more project, with their phone numbers.

Publication

The Plan was then published and a copy delivered to every household in the village. A presentation on it formed part of the Annual Parish Meeting.

APPENDIX 1

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

OPEN EVENING – 25 OCTOBER 2013

QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

QUESTION	ANSWER (BY CHAIR UNLESS STATED)
<p>David Evershed Plan conflicts with Vale of Aylesbury Plan.</p>	<p>The plan should be compliant with the Vale of Aylesbury Plan (VAP). It can have some variations from, but should not totally contradict, the VAP. Local green spaces will not be determined in the VAP.</p>
<p>Gerrard Barker Well done to the PC. Do we have a targeted number of homes? Can MG find the space over the next 20 years?</p>	<p>This is not a number that has been imposed on us – it was generated by us in the Parish Plan. 4 per year on average are the same as the last 20 years. AVDC assumes a village of MG’s size would have about 50 new homes in 20 years.</p>
<p>Justine Pink If there is going to be 80 homes isn’t that going to increase the size of the village by about a fifth? The size is now adequate. Haddenham, as an example, has been ruined by much more development.</p>	<p>Thank you – a welcome comment from a newcomer. Yes 80 homes is about a fifth. Peter Storey We looked at housing demand over a 20 year period. If we had simply looked at the housing needed for the growing population it would be slightly more than 4 per year.</p>
<p>Mike Beckley In the NDP, is 4 new houses the maximum or a target?</p>	<p>The NDP states that 4 is the average number people wanted – not a maximum or a target.</p>
<p>Roy Herring There is a problem retaining young people born in the village – unfortunately, they have no chance of staying in the village.</p>	<p>There are other issues with the mix and type of development. There has been one or two recent major developments e.g. Rectory Close but we now propose 4 houses a year, or 20 over 5 years. The phasing of larger and smaller developments also needs to be considered. About 5 years ago we had a housing needs survey which led to the affordable housing in Station Road (Piece Close). We have applied for a £3K grant to do another housing needs survey in January again to ask the village what need there is for housing suitable for all age ranges, and to determine what goes into the plan.</p>

<p>MARK SLINGSBY</p> <p>IN THIS VILLAGE IT IS NOT POSSIBLE TO BUILD AFFORDABLE HOUSES UNLESS BY A HOUSING ASSOCIATION.</p> <p>WHAT PRICE DO YOU PUT AN AFFORDABLE HOUSE?</p>	<p>IF THE HOUSING IS BUILT TO A HIGH STANDARD – WELL DESIGNED AND ENERGY EFFICIENT, IT OFFERS GREAT BENEFIT TO THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE THERE BUT IT PUTS THE COST UP.</p> <p>WHAT WAS AFFORDABLE IN THE PAST IS NOT AFFORDABLE ANY LONGER. PLANS FOR THE FUTURE SHOULD INCLUDE HOMES THAT ARE AFFORDABLE FOR THOSE ON THE LOWEST 25% OF THE INCOME RANGE</p>
<p>ROY HERRING</p> <p>WE SHOULD LOOK AT LARGER DEVELOPMENTS, NOT JUST INFILL, AS INFILL LAND VALUE IS TOO HIGH FOR THE YOUNG AND ELDERLY EVEN IF THE COST IS PHASED.</p>	<p>I TOTALLY AGREE – THIS IS WHAT WE ARE TRYING TO DO.</p>
<p>PETER FERENS</p> <p>THE VILLAGE WAS SAVED YEARS AGO BY A LADY (?) BY RENTING PROPERTY.</p>	<p>HOPEFULLY, THE OUTCOME OF THE HOUSING NEEDS SURVEY WILL IDENTIFY DEMAND.</p> <p>PEOPLE AT THE LOWER END OF THE HOUSING SCALE CAN'T EVEN AFFORD SHARED EQUITY</p> <p>TO CREATE A RURAL EXCEPTION SITE FOR RENTED PROPERTY, WE HAVE TO PRODUCE HARD EVIDENCE.</p>
<p>DOMINIC DUGGAN</p> <p>IS THERE ANY CONSIDERATION GIVEN TO PROVIDING SPACE FOR NEW BUSINESS OWNERS?</p> <p>A NUMBER OF PEOPLE WORK FROM HOME AND THEY ARE THE TYPE OF BUSINESSES WHICH MAY NEED SPACE.</p> <p>IS SUCH SPACE AVAILABLE WITHIN THE VILLAGE?</p>	<p>WE CAN'T INSIST THAT PROPERTY OWNERS DEVELOP ANYTHING THAT WOULD NOT FULFIL THEIR REQUIREMENTS.</p> <p>REDUNDANT FARM BUILDINGS COULD BE USED FOR BUSINESS PURPOSES</p> <p>SMALLER SCALE BUSINESSES ARE TO BE ENCOURAGED IN THE VILLAGE.</p>
<p>JOHN GARDINER</p> <p>A LOT OF NEW BUILDS CURRENTLY ARE GOING UP IN THE CONSERVATION AREA – PARKING IN THE ROAD IS CAUSING A HAZARD.</p> <p>THE SHOP HAS ALREADY ASKED PERMISSION FOR A CHANGE OF USE.</p>	<p>THE POINT OF THE PLAN IS TO PREVENT ALL THOSE THINGS YOU HAVE DESCRIBED.</p> <p>THERE HAS BEEN A LOT OF ACTIVITY IN RECENT YEARS WHICH WE HAVEN'T BEEN ABLE TO INFLUENCE.</p> <p>WITH THE NDP HOWEVER WE WILL HAVE AN INFLUENCE IN THE FUTURE.</p> <p>WE ARE NOT AWARE OF THE SITUATION WITH THE SHOP. IT WILL BE AYLESBURY VALE'S FINAL DECISION BUT THEIR POLICY GENERALLY IS NOT TO ALLOW CHANGE OF USE OF SUCH FACILITIES. IT IS A COMMUNITY FACILITY AND WE DO NOT HAVE A</p>

	<p>MAJOR SAY IN ITS FUTURE BUT WITH AN NDP OUR INFLUENCE WILL BE GREATER.</p>
<p>GERRARD BARKER</p> <p>WE SHOULD LOOK FOR DEVELOPMENT SITES,</p> <p>I DISAGREE WITH INFILL AND EWELME ARE THE BIGGEST CULPRIT.</p> <p>WE SHOULD FORMULATE A PLAN WHERE THEY DO NOT INFILL.</p>	<p>THEIR ULTIMATE AIM IS TO BENEFIT EWELME AND MG IS A SOURCE OF REVENUE. IN THE PAST THEY BUILT SUFFOLK COURT.</p> <p>THEY WERE UNABLE TO SELL BERRY CLOSE BECAUSE THE FUNDS HAD TO GO TO EWELME.</p> <p>EWELME’S AGENTS SUGGESTED TO THE DISTRICT COUNCIL 5 SITES FOR DEVELOPMENT BUT 3 WERE DEEMED TO BE TOO SMALL; 2 COULD TAKE 10 OR MORE HOUSES – SWAN FIELD AND LEOPOLD FARM.</p> <p>AGAIN, CURRENTLY OUR INFLUENCE IS LIMITED, BUT IF THE PLAN IS ADOPTED WE CAN HAVE A GREATER INFLUENCE.</p>
<p>CHRIS ANSTEY</p> <p>P9 RAISES VERY RELEVANT AND INTER-RELATED POINTS.</p> <p>A LOT OF PEOPLE IN THE VILLAGE ARE VERY DISAPPOINTED AT THE INFILL DEVELOPMENT.</p> <p>A LOT MORE GREEN SPACE SHOULD BE PROTECTED.</p> <p>RURAL EXCEPTION SITES ARE NOT GOING TO BE PUT FORWARD IF YOU ARE NOT GOING TO GET ANYTHING FOR THEM.</p> <p>THERE IS A NEED FOR YOUNGSTERS IN THE VILLAGE – BE BRAVE — P9</p>	<p>I AGREE THAT WE NEED TO DEVELOP A NEED FOR RURAL EXCEPTION SITES.</p> <p>AVDC HAVE APPROACHED EWELME AND OTHER LAND OWNERS TO IDENTIFY SITES THEY ARE PREPARED TO OFFER FOR RURAL EXCEPTION SITES.</p> <p>EWELME DID GIVE THE FIELD IN STATION ROAD AT A VERY LOW COST FOR A RURAL EXCEPTION SITE.</p> <p>YOUR COMMENTS ARE A FURTHER RATIONALE AND JUSTIFICATION FOR US TO PROVIDE OUR OWN NDP SO THAT WE CAN HAVE A GREATER INFLUENCE IN THE FUTURE.</p>
<p>DAVE JONES</p> <p>SUPERFAST BROADBAND IS NOT INCLUDED IN THE PLAN.</p>	<p>I AGREE THAT SUPERFAST BROADBAND SHOULD BE INCLUDED AS ONE OF THE POLICIES.</p>

Appendix 2

Public Meeting Issues

We invited the 60 or so people present to make their views known on some key issues at manned stations with maps and relevant information around the room. This was half-way through the meeting, following the presentation on the draft Plan contents.

We asked people to put a dot on a map of the village to show **where they lived**. There were 50 locations identified, a fair cross-section - with most roads represented. The largest groupings were from Whales Lane, Moat Lane and Spiers Close (12), Swan Lane (6), Rectory Close (5), Little Marsh Road (5), West Edge and Styles Close (5), Bicester Road and Ware Leys Close (4), Church Street (4); plus people from Station Road, Towns End, Clements Lane and Heet Road. There were no attendees from either Millfield Avenue or Millfield Close.

A very busy station was **Potential Sites for Development**, where 40 views were expressed, either verbally or by placing a dot on the map of the village.

The majority favoured building on fields contiguous with, but beyond, the current boundary of the built curtilage.

The most suggested (by 14) was Clements Lane, in the field opposite the village hall and cemetery.

Next came Launton Road (7), opposite the Bicester Road garage.

Third was Berry Close (6), opposite School.

And fourth (5) was the Charndon Road field on the western corner, north of Little Marsh.

There were 3 suggestions of Swan Field, facing onto Little Marsh Road.

There were 2 votes for Launton Road on the western side, beyond the garage.

And 1 each for Station Road – on each side – and for Blackthorn Road.

Three people left comments about the traffic impact of potential development on Scotts Close, Tompkins Lane and on the village generally.

Analysis: We are not designating areas for development in the NDP and so the feedback to the question - whether people could suggest other sites than the five proposed by Ewelme - does not commit us to any action. Rather, the suggested sites simply show that people are content to see development beyond the current built boundary.

Another equally busy station was the one where we asked people whether they would like to see Swan Field and Moat Close designated as **Local Green Spaces**. 42 views were expressed, some in writing and all by placing a dot on the flip-chart.

Moat Close was confirmed by 36 of the 40 responses, five of whom also said that they'd like to have a footpath or pavement around it. Two were against - one said a small development would be OK; and two were undecided.

Swan Field was also supported, by 30 of the 42 responses; although one comment was that it was acceptable to build opposite Little Marsh and two were not against playing fields there. 9 were against designation; comments including that it was a good site for houses and that no assessment had been done on green spaces in the village. 3 were undecided; one saying that a compromise would be houses on Little Marsh Road, parking and playing fields in the south, leaving a green space in the middle.

Analysis: Support for both the Local Green Spaces was strong – the majority were in favour of their designation. Of the two sites, support was stronger for Moat Close (95%) than for Swan Field (68%), where a number of suggestions for compromises were effectively negative to designation.

Another very busy station was the **Mix/type of housing required and who for?**, where 41 written comments were put on the flipchart. Five were not directly relevant to the question.

Of the 36 valid responses, 30 were in favour of either housing for the elderly to downsize into (6), starter homes for young people (9), small/mid- size homes (8) and homes for both the young and elderly (7). There were six other responses, requesting mixed developments (3), affordable/rented (2) and for local people (1).

Analysis: the great majority (83%) agreed with the proposed policy that we support applications that provide homes at the lower end of the size range, suitable for young people and families, and for the elderly. The other six responses were not contrary to this approach.

The station asking people to nominate sites where **development should be discouraged** received 37 dots on the map, with 23 written comments. Moat Close (11+5) and Swan Field (8+3) got the most votes, followed by Charndon Road (4), Clements Lane (4+1) and Berry Close (3+3). Several other sites were nominated by one or two people, including two specifying the Conservation Areas and four commenting against infill; while two suggested larger, edge developments that would be able to include some affordable homes.

Analysis: The results from this question are consistent with the strong backing for Moat Close and Swan Field to be designated as local green spaces. Other nominations are largely self-cancelling by the response to the suggested potential sites question. It is worth noting the comment that larger, edge developments would be better able to include some affordable homes than small infill sites.

We asked people to say whether the new housing should be **phased or in larger developments**. Response was almost evenly divided for phasing (9) and against (7), but 5 others were not relevant. The comments in favour of phasing included building outside the current boundary; a mix of sizes; including social/affordable housing ; maximum of 8 units at a time. Those in favour of larger developments cited edge of village; no infill; range of sizes but not expensive, detached; and that slow phasing would result in larger properties.

Analysis: People saw phasing and larger developments as preferable for very similar reasons. The underlying themes were consistent with the other responses.

Appendix 3

Marsh Gibbon Neighbourhood Development Plan Analysis of Feedback from online and paper-based questionnaires

Prepared by Code Vanilla Ltd on 7th November 2013

41 people responded to the questionnaire where views were sought on each of the 24 sections of the plan, including the 17 specific policies (MG1-MG17). Overall, the sentiments can be summarised as follows:

In agreement	Neutral or Unanswered	Disagreement
78%	18%	4%

Since each question pertains to a specific section/policy on the plan, a more detailed analysis can only be given on this basis. While the agree/neutral/disagree voting system provides a broad reaction to the policy concerned, a respondent's comment adds colour.

Five policies stand out as having the most controversy or concern¹:

- **MG11: Providing Parking Spaces**, where there is wide opposition to street parking facilities.
- **MG6: Infill Housing Development**, where there is wide concern about the freedom to develop on infill sites
- **MG1: Development within Conservation Areas**, where views range from allowing no development in such areas to very restricted development
- **MG5: Developing on the Boundary**, where greater restriction was being called for
- **MG9: Relocation of Businesses**, that attracted some disagreement but also an abnormally large number of neutral votes (21%).

Two policies, while supported, attracted numerous and consistent comment:

- **MG14: Parking for School**, strong feelings about the importance and effectiveness of any solution.
- **MG15: Protection of Community Facilities**, the shop came under heavy criticism.

The rest of the report consists of a cascade of three tables listing responses in increasing levels of detail:

- Table 1 summarises the sentiments on all issues in decreasing order of contention
- Table 2 summarises the commentary responses on each section/policy in order
- Table 3 lists every detailed response for further reference

All data in the report is backed up by a results file as extracted from the online questionnaire database. Most respondents chose to identify themselves and thus points made in this report are traceable back to an individual. While the address of the respondent may be relevant in assessing the responses this was, more often than not, withheld. Other details provided were frequently supplied, but have not been factored into this report as it is unclear how this would add value. Consequently the content of this report is entirely anonymous. Appendix 1 provides an important disclaimer from the report author. The online version of the plan and questionnaire can be reached at <http://tinyurl.com/mgnp-online>.

¹ Policies listed in decreasing order of contention

Table 1: Policies and sections in decreasing order of contention

The order of this table is a weighting of all four quantitative columns and is intended to provide a level of prioritisation when considering the responses to each section/policy.

Section/Policy	% Agree²	% Disagree	# Critical comments	# Cautionary comments
MG11: Providing Parking Spaces	71%	20%	9	3
MG6: Infill Housing Development	54%	20%	5	5
MG1: Development within Conservation Areas	78%	12%	3	6
MG5: Developing on the Boundary	83%	10%	1	5
MG9: Relocation of Businesses	71%	7%		
MG4: Protecting Green Spaces	85%	5%	1	1
MG8: Small Scale Businesses	76%	2%	1	4
MG7: Meeting Local Needs	88%	2%		7
MG15: Protection of Community Facilities	95%	0%		11
MG12: Private Visitor Parking	88%	5%		2
Vision for 2031	93%	2%	3	
MG2: Development outside Conservation Areas	93%	2%	2	1
MG3: Distinctive Local Character	93%	2%	2	1
MG13: Business Traffic	90%	2%	1	2
MG10: Reuse of Farm Buildings	90%	2%		3
MG14: Parking for School	90%			6

² Where no vote is placed, this column assumes a tacit agreement

What is the plan about	88%	2%		1
Issues to be tackled	95%		1	1
MG16: Enhancing Recreation	93%			3
Why this plan	88%			2
Maps	90%			
Strategic context	83%			1
MG17: Protecting Trees and Hedgerows	93%			2
Our village	95%			1

Table 2: Summary of responses for all sections

Respondents were able to comment on each section, and all sections received some commentary. Each comment is categorised as follows:

- Affirming: Comment is backing up the content of the plan
- Critical: Comment is disagreeing with, or stating a significant omission in, the plan
- Cautionary: Comment expresses caution, concern or that plan lacks the right emphasis
- Advisory: Comment is providing additional information, ideas or views
- Question: Comment is a specific question

This categorisation has been an editorial judgement and is intended as an aid to assessing the volume and relevance of responses.

Section/Policy	Affirming	Critical	Cautionary	Advisory	Question	Synopsis <small>Note: This text is edited highlights of respondents comments</small>
Why this plan	1		2	1		Statutory status is important, adopt as soon as possible. Caution on effectiveness despite legal status; Westbury close quoted as example of planners' misguided action. Local amenities and construction needs to be culturally connected to the inhabitants.
What is the plan about	2		1	2	1	More on jobs in Marsh Gibbon. VAP needs to take account of this plan. 17 years to 2031 (not 20). Can AVDC overrule this plan?
Strategic context			1		1	People have different perceptions of growth. Has VAP been adopted?
Our village	1		1	2		The village context must include the separate conservation area for Little Marsh which should not become merged with the main village. Many fields around the village are also Archaeological Notification Areas due to their Ridge and Furrow preservation which is unusual in Buckinghamshire. Too many older people.
Issues to be tackled	1	1	1	5		Shop is terrible. School expansion unsupported if it involves the development of Berry Close field. Retirement homes/flats for residents wishing to downsize. Broadband availability. Pavement around West Edge. Plan lacks comment on parking and HGV traffic; Whales lane example of problem. Concern over HS2 Calvert depot effects. Young people should be given priority.
Vision for 2031	2	3		2		Vision statement pompous/complete rubbish. See appendix 1 for suggestions. Housing for elderly.
MG1: Development within Conservation Areas	1	3	6	1		Development should be restricted or curtailed completely. Conservation and preservation important. Weakly written. UPVC windows should be allowed. PV roof tiles possible in the future.
MG2: Development outside Conservation	1	2	1	1	1	'No heavy vehicles' sign ignored in Moat lane. Forbid development inside conservation area. Limit building, Allow 3 storey houses. What does 'should

Areas						normally' mean?
MG3: Distinctive Local Character		2	1			80 houses too many. Listed buildings of local stone - distinctive character not recognised in the plan. Encourage green space around them.
MG4: Protecting Green Spaces	8	1	1	2	3	Encourage local interest and use. School may need Swan field for playing fields/parking, but not housing. Include using Swan field by school? Is half of Swan field unprotected/being sold? Protected for owners or village as a whole? Should have more protected spaces
MG5: Developing on the Boundary	6	1	5	1		80 homes in 20 years seems a lot and may require over expansion of boundaries. Not all areas suitable. Clarification on 'few larger sites for consultation'. No more than 4 homes grouped together.
MG6: Infill Housing Development	1	5	5	3		Disagreement with infill or should be discouraged. Strong disagreement on larger site infills. Needs to be in keeping with village character. Only on an exceptional basis. Must be affordable. Not if it involves removing green space. Housing should include rented premises.
MG7: Meeting Local Needs	5	0	7	1		No larger houses. Must be affordable. Sheltered housing. Concern that affordable is realistic. Phasing practicalities should be explicit in terms of infill availability and building frequency.
MG8: Small Scale Businesses	3	1	4	1		Noise pollution risks. Attract new businesses. Need high speed broadband. No extensive development. Explicit exclusion of business development in conservation areas. No HGV traffic.
MG9: Relocation of Businesses	3			2		Parkers/Builders yard should relocate.
MG10: Reuse of Farm Buildings	1		3	2		Retain local farming community spirit. Noise pollution. Demolish old, unsightly farm buildings. Application must not conflict with other policies. Commercial uses preferred.
MG11: Providing Parking Spaces	3	9	3			Discourage car ownership. No parking on streets. New housing must provide off-street parking.
MG12: Private Visitor Parking	1		2			Suggest 'adequate visitor parking' as wording. Do not detract from local scene.
MG13: Business Traffic	1	1	2	2		Restrict HGV. Rework to 'must make car parking provision...'
MG14: Parking for School			6	9		Provide lay-by in Castle Street. Use field opposite, use Berry field, use South end of Swan field. Not on local green spaces. Build along Little Marsh. New school on village boundary - relocate. Concern that parents will not use provisioned parking. Parking space insufficient. Strengthen policy on the provision of safe and continuous pavements. School parking most significant issue village faces.
MG15: Protection of Community Facilities				11	1	New shop frequently requested. School expansion important. Would the PC support a community shop? Need a good pub.

MG16: Enhancing Recreation	1		3	2		Cater for older children. Take care to align with other policies and assess the impact they might have. Enhanced facilities should not encourage use from external visitors.
MG17: Protecting Trees and Hedgerows	1		2	6		Hedgerows may need skilled maintenance. Ensure replacement policy. Owners need to check safety of their trees. Policy should be more specific about types and shapes of trees. Need more new trees / continuous planting programme. Create more small copses/woodland.
Maps	1			2		Keep Swan Field and Moat close as green spaces. Land opposite village hall ideal for housing development.

Table 3: Verbatim comments submitted against each section/policy

Each individual comment is listed separately and is preceded by either “+” or “-” to indicate the respondents overall judgement of the section/policy (+ agree, - disagree, neither means the respondent voted neutral or not at all). Comments listed here have not been edited or corrected in any way.

1. Why this Plan

- a. +Local amenities and construction needs to be culturally connected to the inhabitants
- b. +A good idea if it works and the planners don't put a spanner in the works as they did with Westbury Close allowing 4 2/3 bed houses instead of the original 3 with 2 car parks per unit instead of how they park in the road thus obstructing the views coming out of Moat Lane which is very dangerous.
- c. +The fact that this plan has statutory status is very important and we should move ahead with adopting it as soon as possible
- d. +Long time coming but good.

2. What is the Plan About

- a. +Good idea
- b. +Ensuring that the village stays as nice as it is now
- c. +As we understand it the VAP has not yet been adopted but it will need to take account of this plan if we produce it first
- d. +2014-2031 = 17 years.
- e. +Can AVDC pull rank?
- f. +i would like to see more about jobs in Marsh Gibbon

3. Strategic Context

- a. People have different perceptions of growth may cause concerns
- b. +Agree with the context as set out here but has the VAP actually been adopted and approved yet?

4. Our village

- a. +Too many oldies!!!
- b. +Don't forget the other oldest part - the remaining listed buildings comprising the hamlet of Little Marsh - for which Swan Field provides a historical detachment.
- c. +Note that 'Our village' should include the separate hamlet of Little Marsh with its own unique character as recognised by its own Conservation Area. Note also that many fields around the village are also Archaeological Notification Areas due to their Ridge and Furrow preservation which is unusual in Buckinghamshire. Note:
- d. +Need to maintain that unique and splendid environment.

5. Issues to be Tackled

- a. +As in Parish Plan
- b. +Shop is terrible
- c. +Not the School expansion if it involves the development of Berry Close field
- d. It would be such a good idea if there were perhaps some retirement homes/flats etc to cope with the residents wanting to downsize and still stay in The Village
- e. +Plus broadband
- f. +Pavement around West Edge
- g. Lack of comment on parking and HGV traffic. Despite intention this scheme lacks 'teeth'. Highways and Council have consistently failed to improve conditions in Whales lane due to HGV traffic - both parked and other short cut users. With the prospect of 800 people being employed at the new HS2 Calvert depot, operating 24 hrs., 24/7, 365 days P.A. - restricting these traffic movements should be the No. 1 priority - in alliance with all the other affected parishes
- h. +Young should be priority

6. Vision for 2031

- a. +Clear weeds from Pond
- b. +A bit pompous
- c. +Housing for the elderly as well as the young
- d. +Spot on
- e. +However the vision sentence is complete rubbish that no one will ever remember ... should say something simpler like ' A good place to live'
- f. -In my view, to have relevance, any 'vision' should have a strong connection with the plan, either being seen to drive the plan or better still being a succinct summary of it which can be used for communicating it. The current vision statement in para 14 stands in isolation from the actual plan for the village and does not have any connection to the policies nor how the issues are to be resolved. My attempt at such a vision statement is as follows: 'To help meet the expected need for more homes, workplaces and facilities in the village by setting broad plans and policies for expansion which have legal standing and are compatible with the current style and layout of the village.' Note: The plan document already has a challenger to the vision described in para 14 within the document. Point 8 in 'The Strategic Context for Our Plan' refers to the neighbourhood plan being consistent with 'this vision', implying the vision set out in the previous para 7 of the strategic context, rather than the vision in para 14. This suggests in para 7 that the Marsh Gibbon neighbourhood plan vision is 'Provision will be made for limited growth and a mix of land uses to minimise the need for travel, to reduce impacts on local communities, heritage sites and sensitive landscapes and to aim to build [an] integrated community[y], whilst providing high quality access through public transport.'
- g. +A well developed and thought out vision for the parish's future. The need to conserve and preserve what makes MG unique is a matter of top priority.

7. MG1: Development within Conservation

- a. +Restricted building within conservation area
- b. +Need to defend Conservation Areas
- c. +It is possible that photovoltaic roof tiles will be available in the future. These do not look like an add-on so may be acceptable
- d. -What is wrong with UPVC windows? They are extremely efficient and don't any more look like plastic!
- e. Only with restrictions
- f. We do not agree with any more new development in the village.
- g. +Should a conservation area be developed at all?
- h. +Add: Particular consideration should be given to the impact of any proposed development on the setting of historic listed buildings
- i. +Must be careful to preserve.
- j. -The intent and direction is good, but these words are ignored when 'institutions' wish to develop. Ewelme is allowed to sell and develop without restriction and 'Conservation Areas' are not respected. No development should be allowed in Conservation Areas. You cannot say it will be allowed if in harmony - this is a general principal for all normal development. This is weak and written in a way to continue to permit development.
- k. As appropriate

8. MG2: Development outside Conservation Areas

- a. +Agree, no ugly buildings within village!
- b. +whilst referring to Moat Close, it is a pity that heavy vehicles seem to ignore the sign at the pond end of Moat Lane which states 'no heavy vehicles'. It is a country lane which should be upheld.
- c. +This should be strict and limited. Boundary dev. should be prioritised.
- d. +What does 'should normally mean'
- e. +Occasional 3 storey houses where applicable
- f. +Clements Lane
- g. +Development should ONLY be allowed outside Conservation areas and be in harmony with street scene.

9. MG3: Distinctive Local Character

- a. -80 houses over the plan period are too many. A contradiction if you like in my asking why only two semi-detached properties have been permitted by the planners on the site next to Swan Farm where there was enough room for at least 3 pairs of semis. There doesn't seem to be any reason why they act as they do.
- b. +The many listed buildings of local stone in the village are a key part of its distinctive local character - this point is not explicitly recognised in the plan at present but is actually the most notable feature of the village to any visitor and must be preserved when considering any proposals for new buildings
- c. +Should be encouraged to have large green space around them, not crammed in.

10. MG4: Protected Green Spaces

- a. +Landscape and townscape views to be protected as designated in the Conservation Area document 1980
- b. +Both Swan Field and Moat Close should be local green space but more should be done with them to allow local resident access and interest. Introduction of nature trails/signs etc might generate more interest.
- c. +The School might need to use Swan field for playing fields
- d. +But recognise that use of Swan Field as playing fields, with a small area for parking, may be acceptable. Certainly NOT housing
- e. -School needs Swan Field for parking. Build along Little Marsh to pay for School expansion. Moat Close fine
- f. +Essential we keep these areas green
- g. +These areas need to be protected as 'open' spaces.
- h. +Would this include using it as a school field?
- i. -1/2 Swan Field not protected
- j. +It is essential that both sites are preserved as Green Spaces as they are a key part of the village landscape
- k. Note that whole of Swan Field is indicated on the map (hope there is no truth in the rumour that part has been sold)
- l. Swan Field - compromise. North - ribbon building. South car park and playing field
- m. School needs Swan Field for parking. Houses on Little Marsh Road would be no problem
- n. What does this mean? Can all parishioners use these spaces freely or are they simply protected spaces for the owners of them? Stopping development but adding no benefit to the rest of the village. Why only these?
- o. +Should be more

11. MG5: Developing on the boundary

- a. +Developing on the boundary would be a good idea to relieve pressure on the village.
- b. +Bicester Road
- c. +Relieve potential overcrowding in village itself
- d. -80 homes in 20 years would increase the size of the village by a fifth!
- e. +Any such development should be clearly separated from the existing Conservation Areas
- f. +Bicester Road Blackthorn Road Station Road and Clements Lane might be suitable others are not
- g. +This should definitely be allowed
- h. +Need to clarify the 'few larger sites for consultation'
- i. +Keep village compact
- j. +Completely agree this should be the way forward
- k. +prefer not to have more than 4 homes grouped together
- l. +It will not be possible to add new housing each year without the village expanding beyond current boundaries. Specific areas (fields) should be identified as proposed sites.
- m. +With great care

12. MG6: Infill Housing Development

- a. -Infill housing isn't the answer to the villages problems
- b. -11. Totally disagree with ribbon development
- c. +Don't cramp the village centre
- d. Infill should be discouraged
- e. Each proposal should be decided on its merits

- f. -Agree with small infill sites where this is appropriate but strongly disagree with the proposition that there are any larger sites available within the village boundary capable of accommodating up to another 40 dwellings in total
- g. Depends on the size, sensitivity and site of the application
- h. +In keeping with v. character
- i. +Has been a 'con'
- j. Larger developments so that mixed houses built including rented premises
- k. -I would prefer this to be worded more like: infill will only be permitted as an exception and only if the proposal...
- l. +change 'should' to MUST provide homes that local people can afford
- m. -Most interior land is green land. Brown site infill is desired, but where are these in the village? To in-fill means removal of green space which is detrimental to the village.
- n. As appropriate

13. MG7: Meeting Local Needs

- a. +No more 4 and 5 bedroom houses
- b. +Agree., but not sure how that will be possible with just infill.
- c. +How about a sheltered housing scheme
- d. +Must be genuinely affordable
- e. +A development similar to the maisonettes on Swan Lane could provide low cost, first homes. I think that development is a good example of what can be achieved
- f. +Need homes for start-up families
- g. +New shop. Affordable housing
- h. +'affordable' would be difficult in this village
- i. This policy needs to be strengthened in regard to phasing - an average completion rate of 20 homes every 5 years implies that no application will be considered for more than 12 homes in any one year and this should be written in to the policy
- j. Phasing is important and should be included in the policy - 4 homes every year makes more sense for local needs than 20 homes lumped every 5 years
- k. Lower priced housing in this village
- l. +Deffo
- m. +change 'should' to MUST provide homes that local people can afford

14. MG8: Small Scale Businesses

- a. +Attracting new businesses to MG should also be included. A development of modern, well-connected small units would benefit. High-speed broadband would be essential if MG is to be an alternative to local towns.
- b. Noise pollution issues?
- c. As long as appropriate and doesn't open flood gate to extensive redevelopment
- d. This is not acceptable
- e. This policy should be strengthened to exclude any applications for business development within the Conservation Areas
- f. Each on its own merit - but not in a Conservation Area
- g. +No HGV traffic / onsite parking
- h. +Need jobs
- i. As appropriate

15. MG9: Relocation of Businesses

- a. +Builders Yard should relocate
- b. Would need to see examples
- c. Each on its own merit
- d. +Parkers yard is in the wrong place
- e. As appropriate

16. MG10: Reuse of Farm Buildings

- a. +As long as feel of local farming community is not lost
- b. +Some old farm buildings are an eyesore and should be demolished
- c. +Noise pollution issues?
- d. +Prefer commercial uses
- e. +Add: provided that such applications do not conflict with policies MG1 - 8 above
- f. Each on its own merit

17. MG11: Providing Parking Spaces

- a. +Cars are vital in a village but not parked on the road
- b. -Need to discourage car ownership - this will encourage it
- c. -Cars are not good for the environment. In 20 years we should not still have a '1 adult = 1 car' attitude, What about a car pool or car sharing scheme. How many trips/miles do people drive? What about a 'Boris' Electric Cars' scheme?
- d. Parking needs to be provided for all new housing including terraced properties.
- e. -Should be provided with site
- f. No parking on street
- g. -Do not agree that shared parking on street is acceptable. Any proposals on terraced housing schemes must comply with policies MG1 and MG2, which implies that they will need to be outside the Conservation Areas
- h. YES to private and visitor parking spaces on site NO to building terraced houses with ON ROAD PARKING which is no longer an acceptable standard
- i. +This is extremely important
- j. +Excellent idea
- k. -No more street parking.
- l. -Every house needs parking space x 2
- m. +Get cars off the road where possible
- n. +Strongly agree that there needs to be similar number of spaces to bedrooms
- o. -The intrusion from cars parked on roads is a serious safety issue and visually unattractive for residents. There should be specific provision within new developments such that NO cars need be parked on the road. Terrace style developments should allow for parking off the road, such as Swan Lane maisonettes as a good example.

18. MG12: Private Visitor Parking

- a. +As long as this is not a prominent feature of any development and detracts from any local scene.
- b. +Excellent idea
- c. +This should say ' provision must be made for adequate visitor parking'

19. MG13: Business Traffic

- a. +I'm sure you have discussed this a good deal, but just to add my thoughts: Lorries that are far too big for the road are an issue in West Edge (and I'm sure many other parts of the village) and particularly dangerous at the corner by Styles Edge where the old village hall used to be bearing in mind there is no pavement and children use this route to go to school. The situation will get very much worse when the incinerator, East-West rail and HS2 are under construction. A weight restriction order could be sought from Bucks CC like they have in Islip which seems to work well. You can see from below that Oxfordshire are somewhat more positive about the effect than Bucks, but it would certainly act as a deterrent and a legitimate reason to restrict contractor vehicles -local agricultural vehicles would of course have to be exempted. Whales Lane should have a 7.5 tonne limit installed soonest, such is the danger of 40 tonne trucks trying to deliver to Parkers. HGV weight restrictions would also be a major factor in reducing road damage which in parts of the village is a very serious issue. <http://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/content/weight-restriction-orders>
<http://www.transportforbucks.net/Roads-highways-and-pavements/Weight-and-width-restrictions.aspx>
- b. +Regulate lorries
- c. +Appropriate access is critical
- d. +But no more HGV traffic
- e. +Must instead of should

20. MG14: Parking for School

- a. +Lay by to be created in the green verge in Castle Street
- b. +Should use the field opposite for a car park
- c. +Parents should know better
- d. +School needs Swan Field for parking. Build along Little Marsh to pay for School expansion.
- e. +New school on boundary of village
- f. +But doubt some parents will use it
- g. School should be relocated - parking essential for existing capacity
- h. Policy needs to be strengthened to include enhanced provision for safe and continuous pavements - at present this is noted as an issue but there is no corresponding policy
- i. +Safe parking for school is required whether school expands or not. Several village roads need DESIGNATED FOOTWAYS
- j. +This cannot be assessed on its own, it must be judged on school expansion plans, but not on Swan Field.
- k. +As near as possible to school - Berry Field
- l. +at South end of Swan Field
- m. +But disagree with parking on local green spaces
- n. +Like Swan Field
- o. +Creating school parking spaces is essential, currently not adequate. If more numbers, it will be worse.
- p. +Possibly the single most significant road safety issue in the village is around the school

21. MG15: Protection of Community Facilities

- a. +New shop needed urgently, appreciate there isn't anything the council can do about this.
- b. +New shop please
- c. +New shop essential
- d. +Need a new shop
- e. +And the opportunities to enhance, e.g. shop and school
- f. +Expansion of the school I feel is very important in a growing village.
- g. +But it's not clear what the PC would or could plan to do about the shop for example - would they support the development of a community run shop if the present shop closes?
- h. +Use it or lose it!
- i. +Need at least one good pub
- j. +We need a better shop
- k. +These are essential amenities, not all being effectively run for the village currently. Examples nearby such as Twyford stores and The Mushroom Club in Claydon demonstrate how communities can participate in running locally focused viable amenities.
- l. +Particularly shop

22. MG16: Enhancing Recreation

- a. Need area/equipment for older children
- b. +Enhance current recreation areas and support sustainable growth
- c. +For older kids
- d. +But any proposals must have regard to other policies on e.g. car parking, conservation etc
- e. +What and where? Lights, traffic, parking and noise
- f. +Enhancing recreation should be combined with it being for the Parish (or immediate surrounds)
Improved facilities will attract larger numbers from further afield and this would not be desired.

23. MG17: Protecting Trees and Hedgerows

- a. +Ensure new planting when trees and hedgerows must be removed. Many hedgerows need good, skilled maintenance rather than annual 'mowing'
- b. +Policy MG 17 is the right one, but the tree that fell across West Edge not too long ago into the garden of The Cottage where Peter and Isobel Evans live, highlights the need for owners to check the condition of their trees regularly, it was apparently known that this particular tree had been rotten for some time -fortunately no one was injured on this occasion, but if it had fallen in the day when they might have been in the garden or on a car, it hardly bears thinking about. The maintenance of hedgerows also needs improvement. Again, I'm sure

you will have discussed this, but there is a forthcoming threat from the incinerator at Calvert, in terms of the chimney emissions. I understand that the burning of waste can lead to cancer causing dioxins to be released into the atmosphere and whilst I have no doubt that the contractor will convince everyone that they have the necessary technology to eliminate this -will there be any independent monitoring of the facility?

- c. +Policy should be strengthened to state that further trees to be planted should be native species that are appropriate to their setting, particularly in Conservation Areas
- d. +Ensure that trees of inappropriate height and species are not planted in Conservation Areas and not near buildings and boundaries
- e. +Need to be more proactive on new trees.
- f. +Continual planting programme
- g. +Trees have natural cycles. Continual planting allows occasional removal also.
- h. +Parish Council has supported such schemes previously that now are maturing woodland and more of the same should be done. Certain smaller fields or portions around and within the village could be turned into small copses/woodland and be open areas providing a diversity from just open flat green space. Recently a large copse on Tompkins lane was destroyed, yet the small field adjoining could be planted with trees to replace and provide open amenity land accessible from the Greyhound.
- i. +Strongly agree

24. Maps

- a. +Swan Field and Moat Close should be green spaces. I feel the area next to the garage and the land opposite the village hall would make an ideal location for further housing development as it would impact on the minimum number of people.
- b. +Neither Swan Field nor Moat Close are suitable for development and any conflicting proposals displayed at the consultation meeting under reference SHL/MGB/005 should be modified accordingly
- c. +Agree, but there is no value to this unless it is an absolute barrier on development.

Appendix 1: Disclaimer & Sources

This report has been prepared by Code Vanilla based on responses logged into the online version of the Marsh Gibbon Neighbourhood Plan between the dates of 19th October 2013 and 2nd November 2013. Data has been collected, analysed and represented in the above report to the best of our ability. However, Code Vanilla do not provide any guarantees as to the accuracy and correctness of the results shown and cannot be held responsible for any actions or consequences resulting from the use of this report. The report also includes subjective, editorial summaries and Code Vanilla makes no warranties as to the appropriateness or relevance of these. The source of data is a CSV file exported from the online questionnaire database. Some pre-processing of this data was required to remove some repetitive entries due to one or two users restarting their responses. In another situation a family has responded simultaneously and where some comments were precisely duplicated, these have been consolidated. In short, the data has been subject to some editorial filtering and subjective interpretation that is deemed reasonable and correct but for which Code Vanilla cannot be held responsible.

Appendix 4
Pre-submission Consultees

Consultees	Pre-submission Consultation (Reg 14)		
Consultee type	Contact Name	Organisation	Date letter/link emailed
Local planning authority, county council or parish council - any part of whose area is in or adjoins the area of the local planning authority	1. Andy Kirkham	Aylesbury Vale District Council	18/01/2014
	2. Louise Stephens		18/01/2014
	Darl Sweetland	Bucks County Council	18/01/2014
	Lois Partridge	Oxfordshire CC Council	18/01/2014
	Planning Policy Team	Cherwell District Council	18/01/2014
	A J Collett	Poundon Parish Meeting	19/01/2014
	Clerk	Charndon Parish Council	19/01/2014
	Clerk	Edgcott PC	19/01/2014
	Clerk	Ludgershall PC	19/01/2014
	Clerk	Grendon Underwood PC	19/01/2014
	Clerk	Calvert Green PC	19/01/2014
	Clerk	Blackthorn PC	19/01/2014
	Clerk	Launton PC	21/01/2014
	Cllr Jackie Phipps	AVDC Councillor for Marsh Gibbon ward	18/01/2014
Cllr Angela Macpherson	Bucks CC, for Grendon Underwood div.	18/01/2014	
Local partnership	Jean Fox	Community Impact Bucks	18/01/2014
Housing Association	Wendy Farrell	Vale of Aylesbury Housing Trust	18/01/2014
The Coal Authority			19/01/2014
Homes and Communities Agency	1. Mail@hca...	HCA	19/01/2014
	2. Andrew Pearson		21/01/2014
Natural England	Mr Charles Routh	Natural England	19/01/2014
The Environment Agency	Ms C Harrison	The Environment Agency	19/01/2014 Word.doc on 20/01/2014
Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission	Mr C Welch	English Heritage	19/01/2014
Network Rail	Ms Diane Clarke	Network Rail Infrastructure Limited	19/01/2014
Highways Agency	Mr A Watson		19/01/2014
Any person to whom the electronic communications code applies by virtue of a direction given under section 106(3)(a) of the Communications Act 2003			19/01/2014
		Mobile Phone Operators Association	
Primary Care Trust established under section 18 of the National	Ms T Donnelly	Buckinghamshire NHS	Returned to Sender (no longer in existence)

Health Service Act		Primary Care Trust	
A person to whom a licence has been granted under section (1)(b) and (c) of the Electricity Act 1989(b)		East Midlands Electricity Board	Posted on 24/01/2014 Pegasus Business Park, East Midlands Airport, Castle Donnington, DE74 2TU
A person to whom a licence has been granted under section 7(2) of the Gas Act 1986(c)	AMEC Environment & Infrastructure UK	On behalf of the National Grid	Posted on 24/01/2014 Business Planning Floor B6, 80 St Mary's Road, Southampton SO9 5AT
Sewerage and water undertakers	Max Shone	Anglian Water	21/01/2014
	Carmelle Bell (Savills)	Thames Water	19/01/2014
Schools in parish	1. Matt Smith (Chair of Governors) 2. Office@MGS...	Marsh Gibbon CE First School	18/01/2014
			18/01/2014
Youth organisation	Louise Metherell (Sec)	Scout Group Executive	18/01/2014
Religious organisations	David Hiscock (Rector)	Swan Team Ministry	18/01/2014
	Roy Lambourne (Chair)	St Mary's Parochial Church Council	18/01/2014
	Elma Brown (Elder)	United Reformed Church	24/01/2014
	1. Admin 2. Jo Taylor (Elder)	Highway Church	23/01/2014
Local landowners affected by Green Space designation	John Phipps	(Moat Close)	18/01/2014
	Andrew Robson (Sidleys) – agents for Ewelme Trust	(Swan Field)	18/01/2014
	James Oliver (Chief Executive)	Ewelme Trust	18/01/2014
Bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the neighbourhood	Cranfield University	South East Midlands Local Enterprise Partnership	19/01/2014
	Bucks Thames Valley Local Enterprise Partnership		19/01/2014
	Mr Rupert Watts	Bucks Business First	19/01/2014
Local organisations and those individuals who asked to be kept informed of progress of MGNDP	Peter Storey	Old Folks Fund Committee	18/01/2014
	1. June Smith (Chair) 2. Carol Render (Secretary)	Village Hall Management Committee	18/01/2014 18/01/2014
	Andrew Barsby Barbara Storey Carl Needham		18/01/2014 18/01/2014 18/01/2014

	Chris Wilkins		18/01/2014
	Dominic Duggan		18/01/2014
	David Evershed		18/01/2014
	Penny Evershed (MGPC)		18/01/2014
	Gerrard Barker		18/01/2014
	Gillian Beckley		18/01/2014
	Mike Beckley		18/01/2014
	Jennifer McMaster		18/01/2014
	Jenny Berry		18/01/2014
	John Tofts		18/01/2014
	Melissa Wright		18/01/2014
	Mike Hall		18/01/2014
	Nick Lyon		18/01/2014
	Penny Cargill		18/01/2014
	P M Bonner		18/01/2014
	Peter Morgan		18/01/2014
	Peter Ferens		18/01/2014
	Val Summers (MGPC)		18/01/2014
	[6 by email – names unclear]		18/01/2014

