

Hanslope Neighbourhood Plan

CONSULTATION STATEMENT

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Neighbourhood Area Designation**
- 3. Consultation Policy**
- 4. Dateline of Events**
- 5. First Open Meetings 2016**
- 6. Village Survey**
- 7. Development of the Plan**
- 8. Parish Council Public Consultation**
- 9. Evidence Base**

1. Introduction

This consultation statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 in respect of the Hanslope Neighbourhood Plan (HNP). 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:-

- i. Contain details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan
- ii. Explain how they were consulted
- iii. Summarise the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted
- iv. Describe how those issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.

2. Neighbourhood Area Designation

The Neighbourhood Area was designated by Milton Keynes Council, in December 2015, under the provisions of the Localism Act of 2011, and of the Neighbourhood Planning General Regulations 2012. The designated area coincides with the Parish boundary and does not intrude into neighbouring parishes

3. Consultation Policy

At the beginning of the process to develop a Neighbourhood Plan for Hanslope, the Parish Council took the decision to progress the plan by setting up a working group consisting of members of the council and residents of Hanslope who volunteered to join it.

After taking advice it was also decided to use the two Parish Council Open Meetings held in April and October each year as being the main vehicles to both consult with residents and other interested parties about the development of the plan and to inform them of progress. These meetings were held in the large hall in the village hall, which were attended on some occasions during the planning process by over 100 residents.

In addition a new 'public time' was added to the regular monthly Parish Council meetings and the Neighbourhood Development Plan added as a regular item on the agenda. Minutes of the proceedings of both the monthly Parish Council and the Open meetings were made available on the Parish Council notice board and the village web site.

It was felt that this ongoing method of consultation would provide residents with a reassurance that the plan was being developed to take into account the opinions of the majority of the residents of the parish. This was particularly important given the impact of a number of large scale planning applications for residential developments on the boundaries of the village that were lodged over the period from 2016 to 2018. These began shortly after the decision to 'make' a Neighbourhood plan was taken.

Dealing with the impact of these large scale planning applications severely impaired the ability of the 'working group' and the Parish Council to follow the smooth path to

developing a Neighbourhood Plan that is implied in the advisory documents. Taking account of these large scale planning applications within the plan has been problematic and suffered from sometimes conflicting advice from planning consultants and officers of MK Council. It is a testament to the hard work and resolve of those involved in developing a Neighbourhood Plan for Hanslope, that it has progressed to the submission stage.

4. Dateline of Events

Date	Activity
2015	
15 October	OP meeting– residents informed of the need to make a Neighbourhood plan.
	PC meeting– the steps required to do this were set out in the document –‘Producing a Neighbourhood Plan for Hanslope’.
20 October	Interim WG meeting - of parish council members discussed the establishment of the designated area.
15 November	PC ,meeting– agreed that designated area proposed to MKC should be the parish boundary.
15 December	PC meeting– representation from developer of outline plan for re development of the Globe public house in Long St and building of up three house in part of the car park – if approved this could become part of the HNP.
2016	
11 January	PC meeting– agreed the need to expand the WG to include a wide cross section of representatives of village residents and those with a knowledge of neighbourhood planning issues
19 January	Interim WG meeting - to discuss procedures, protocols contents of the survey of all residents to establish their views on the development of the village/parish
8 February	PC meeting - reported that the proposed designated area – the parish boundary, had been approved by MKC
17 March	Interim WG meeting - following PC meeting on 14 March, to agree draft survey questions, subsequently and sent to James Williamson MKC for comments
11 April	OP meeting- Residents informed about the village survey that was scheduled to be sent to all households in the early summer
	PC meeting - <i>reported that the small development of 12 houses in Long Street for which planning permission was applied for in 2015 but refused by MKDCC, has been granted on appeal</i> – inspectors citing the lack of 5 year land supply – this it was believed could lead to developers making other applications affecting the parish, taking advantage of the situation before they are potentially constrained by neighbourhood plan.
9 May	PC meeting – to meet concern over the possibility of bias given the rumours about and residents opposition to large scale panning applications the PC agreed with the WG to have the analysis of the survey undertaken by and independent analyst.
June	Draft survey finalised and a pilot survey was undertaken to test the format. An independent analyst with connections to the Open University – Catherine Mc Nulty was appointed.

24 July	Survey sent to all households in the parish by this date with a three week period being given to complete and return the survey forms.
August /September	The survey returns were analysed and a report of the results prepared by the independent analyst.
	<i>In August the concerns of the residents were realised with the application for outline planning permission for 150 houses to be built on open agricultural land on the boundary of the village off Castlethorpe Rd.</i>
12 September	PC meeting – representatives of the residents urged the Parish Council to object to the 150 house Castlethorpe Rd application and not to include it in the HNP. Preliminary results of the survey clearly supported this view with only a very small proportion of those that returned forms being in favour of developments over 50 houses.
16 October	OP Meeting – the main results of the survey were outlined to the over 100 residents who attended the meeting to raise concerns about the large scale Castlethorpe Rd application and the rumours of others. Representatives of the Interim WG requested volunteers to join the group that reflected a cross section of residents required to develop a HNP that took account of the issues raised in the survey and all other representations.
November	<i>Application made for outline planning permission for 141 houses on open agricultural land on the boundary of the village off Long Street Road.</i>
3 November	WG meeting – expanded group of 12 comprising members of the PC and representatives of residents met to discuss the whole philosophy about developing a HNP in the face of these large scale planning applications. It was agreed to proceed but to seek advice from contacts in MKC and/private planning consultants about how the plan could handle these large scale outline planning applications if they were approved. The WG divided the work required to prepare a draft plan into nine areas of work and members of the group were allocated into working groups to progress each area of work.
14 November	PC meeting – agreed to publish the results of the full survey on the village web site. Representations were made by residents for the PC to object to the 141 house Long Street Road application on the grounds of the detrimental effect on the village environment of such cumulative development and for it not to be included in the HNP. The chair agreed on behalf of the WG to contact Hanslope Park to ascertain their likely impact on a HNP (located in the parish this government establishment is the largest employer in North Buckinghamshire, whose staff in journeying to work from outside of the village already make a great contribution to the traffic problems affecting the village during rush hours especially).
7 December	PC meeting - the representatives of the WG reported that the first draft of the HNP was being prepared.
2017	
9 January	<i>PC meeting – residents informed that at the MKDCC meeting on 5 Jan the outline planning application for 150 houses off Castlethorpe Rd had been approved.</i>
24 January	WG meeting – the group asked for advice from MKC representatives Diane Webber and James Williamson about how a HNP could take account of the outline planning permission for 150 houses off Castlethorpe Rd, without incurring the need to identify even further additional large areas for potential

	development. In addition how this could be further influenced by the 141 house proposal for outline planning for land off Long Street Rd . The officers agreed to consider this within the context of both other neighbourhood plans that had been or were being prepared in other outlying parishes in Milton Keynes, and the developing Plan:MK- which at the time included a provision for up to 1,000 additional houses in the rural areas of Milton Keynes of which Hanslope would be expected to take a proportion.
February	Input from the WG working groups was processed to produce the 1st draft of a HNP- this was sent around for comment within the group and a 2 nd draft produced – but there were still many outstanding issues to be resolved, and a 3 rd and 4th draft followed, but still incomplete.
13 March	PC meeting – representatives of the WG appraised the PC of progress and that the 4th draft had also been sent to James Williamson of MKC for comments
10 April	OP meeting – residents informed of progress of HNP, but there was a general concern that the ongoing MKC 5 year land supply issues was still encouraging application for development on open countryside bordering the village. The ward councillors provided an update on the ongoing discussions about Plan: MK and how it may affect the production of a HNP. <i>PC reported that an application for outline planning permission for a minimum of 9 houses on open agricultural land on the boundary of the village near the recreation ground had been received.</i> <i>There were also rumours about outline planning permission being applied for a further 200 houses on open agricultural land on the boundary of the village off Eastfield Drive</i>
8 May	PC meeting – representations were made by residents for the PC to object to the 200 house Eastfield Drive proposal and that this area should not be included for development in the HNP – <i>(Note – neither the PC or the WG had at this point, or since, up to Nov 2018, received any representation from the potential developers of this land that it should be taken account of in a future HNP).</i>
16 May	WG meeting – to discuss comments from James Williamson about how to proceed from the 4 th draft of the HNP , taking into account the proposed and approved outline developments and the potential need to identify additional sites. Also advised that to aid further drafting and to ensure that the report met the necessary Neighbourhood Planning legal protocols that the services of a planning professional would be useful.
12 June	PC meeting – further representation by residents objecting to the 200 house Eastfield Drive proposal
20 June	WG meeting- following considerations of proposals of help from a number of consultants Neil Homer was selected. After consideration of what had been produced so far it was recommend that two WG sub groups be formed to consider and strengthen the key Policies in the draft plan - the first to look at Policy B – the housing needs of the village/parish; the second to look at the remainder- Policy Group A, the issues within the conservation area and the wider village concerning the conservation area, business and commerce, traffic management and parking; Policy C, the green environment throughout the parish; Policy D community services and facilities; Policy E, traffic and transport; Policy F, employment and Policy G, Hanslope Park. Neil Homer

	undertook to strengthen the sections involving the planning and legal framework.
10 July	<p>PC meeting – <i>representations received from developers wanting to re develop the Equestrian centre site on the outskirts of the village (which was developed on land that had previously been Malt Mill farm)- proposing at that time 15 high quality houses - this application was subsequently revised and in 2018 emerged as an outline proposal for 50 dwellings.</i></p> <p>It was reported that Councillor Proctor had resigned from the WG because of his interest as an agent representing the land owners behind the Long Street Road proposal.</p>
August/September	WG sub groups worked on improving the Policy's set out in draft 4
11 September	PC meeting – informed that following MKDCC turning down the 141 house Long Street Road proposal , the developers had decided to take this to appeal, which it was believed would be heard in Nov/Dec 2017
27 September	WG meeting – to discuss the output from the two sub groups , information provided by Neil Homer and information from Diane Webber of MKC . The latter concerned the resolution of the inspector of the Sherington Neighbourhood plan that land accepted for outline planning permission could be included as part of the development land allocation within a Neighbourhood plan and this could therefore negate the need to find additional sites to meet the Neighbourhood planning requirements. This has key implications of the development of the HNP and the treatment of the Castlethorpe Rd site and others that may be approved.
9 October	<p>OP meeting - progress on the HNP was outlined, but for the residents attending the main issue was how the PC was responding to the appeal on the proposed 141 house Long Street Road planning application.</p> <p>Following this meeting the first drafts of the Pre Submission HNP were produced.</p>
1 November	WG meeting – to discuss the 3 rd draft of the Pre Submission plan with Neil Homer and Diane Webber also in attendance and advised that the plan was progressing well but that it also needed to be accompanied by a Character and Design Statement that could be included as an Appendix. A sub group of the WG comprising Andy Grout, Paul Etherington, Martin Palmer, Dorothy Courtman and Elieen Price were allocated the task of preparing this by early in the new year.
13 November	PC meeting – received report on progress on the HNP. Informed that the appeal against the MKDCC decision to refuse planning permission for the 141 house Long Street Rd application would be heard from mid Nov to early Dec- the involvement on Councillors in this subsequently delayed progress with the HNP.
December	Work proceeding on the Character and Design Statement

2018	
8 January	PC meeting – informed of progress on building the Character and Design Statement into the HNP in to a 4 th draft, but with maps to be added
9 January	WG meeting – discussed and reviewed the 5 th draft of the Pre Submission plan, but there was a view that the submission of the plan would have to wait until the outcomes of the Long Street Road appeal was known as there was concern as to the impact of this on the HNP.
12 February	PC meeting – <i>informed that the inspector had found in favour of the 141 Long Street Road development.</i> The WG representatives were concerned about the impact of this on the drafting of the Pre Submission plan and would need to take advice. The PC also decided to take further legal advice on the possibility of questioning the inspectors decision.
12 March	PC meeting – legal advice on the 141 house Long Street Road decision was still awaited. The WG representatives reported that a 6 th draft of the Pre Submission document and been sent to Diane Webber of MKC and a that meeting had been set up to discuss the further development plan and publishing of the of the ‘Pre Submission’ plan, in view of the local planning situation, with rumours of more plans for large scale housing development in the Hanslope area being proposed, causing disquiet among residents and the WG about the purpose of a HNP
15 March	<p>Meeting between Diane Webber and Martin Palmer as chair of Hanslope PC and representative of the of the WG , underlined the importance that MKC attached to neighbourhood plans being developed despite the issues raised by the planning situation on the whole MK area (due to the perceived lack of a 5 year land supply. It was also confirmed that the 141 house outline plan for Long Street, could be built into the HNP under the ‘Sherington Protocol’ as outlined to the WG meeting of 27 September 2017.</p> <p>After this meeting and on this basis further drafts of the ‘Pre Submission plan were prepared</p>
9 April	<p>OP meeting - residents attending were reassured of the need to progress with a HNP as per the outcome of the advice from MKC and the legal opinion to the PC sought about the inspectors decision on the 141 house Long Street Road appeal In brief this said that that while there was very little likelihood of the PC being able to make a legal challenge - to quote:</p> <p>‘ It is little or no comfort that other parish councils and neighbourhoods up and down the country have had similar experiences and decisions such as this one undermine confidence in the concept of neighbourhood planning. However whilst this decision is disappointing for HPC, I would recommend that HPC press on with the preparation of its Neighbourhood Development Plan’.</p>

	<p>The historical progress to date in producing HNP was outlined by the Chair of the PC and residents were informed that the next step was to produce a Pre Submission version of the plan to provide a formal six week opportunity for local people and other stakeholders and statutory bodies to comment on the proposed policies. All being well it was expected that the Pre Submission document would be finalised and made available in the next few weeks.</p>
14 May	<p>PC meeting – 7th draft of the ‘Pre Submission’ plan was approved by the PC, and discussions took place on managing the consultation required. It was decided that in view of the existing plans from developers and the possibility of others (<i>e.g. at an Extraordinary PC meeting on 17 April – it was reported that the outline proposal for the Equestrian centre that surfaced in July 2017, had been expanded to a proposal for the erection of 51 dwellings</i>), that an independent ‘Consultation Co-ordinator’ be appointed to oversee and provide an independent report to the WG on the outcome of the consultation.</p>
11 June	<p>PC meeting – WG reported that Sophie Jamieson had been appointed as the ‘Consultation Co-ordinator’ for the Pre- Submission plan. Arrangements for publishing the availability of the ‘e- version’ of the plan for consultation on PC notice boards, the village web site and the PC newsletter (to be distributed to all households in the Parish in late June). A small number (60) hard copies were also produced for distribution for those that requested one, but it was expected that most would utilise the ‘e version’.</p>
20 June	<p>WG meeting - agree final amendments to the 8th draft of the Pre Submission plan to be sent out for consultation.</p>
June	<p>Pre submission plan sent out for consultation in the final week in June 2018 with the consultation period ending on 12 August. All replies whether in an ‘e - form’ or hard copy submissions were directed to the Consultation Co-ordinator, a report from whom was expected in early September</p>
9 July	<p>PC meeting – <i>informed of further applications to develop land on the boundaries of the village 1. An outline plan for 50 houses to the side of Castlethorpe Rd, near Cuckoo Hill Farm. 2. An outline plan for 12 houses on land bordering the allotments.</i> Neither of the developers involved with these plans had consulted the PC about the insertion of these into a HNP.</p>
10 September	<p>PC meeting – <i>informed that the outline planning applications for 51 houses on the Equestrian centre and 9 to 12 houses near the recreation ground had been refused by MKDCC – chief reasons being that they were both in contravention of MK Policy S10 , and that in the case of the former its location on the far borders of the village was considered as not sustainable</i></p>
18 September	<p>WG meeting – to discuss the report of the Consultation Co-ordinator and the extent to which the final submission document needed to be amended to take account of the responses received. Also to take account of</p> <p>a) meetings during August and early September that the PC had with both Hanslope health surgery and the school, both very concerned that it would be very difficult for them to cope with the increase in</p>

	<p>population for the 300 plus houses proposed as part of the Castlethorpe Road and Long Street Road developments that in themselves represented an estimated 30% increase in residents, without adding even more developments onto the village</p> <p>b) updates of the traffic surveys commissioned by the PC that outlined the severe congestion now being experienced , especially during rush hours, without further problems caused by the new and other proposed developments.</p>
8 October	<p>PC meeting – informed that <i>the outline planning application for 50 houses to the side of Castlethorpe Rd, near Cuckoo Hill Farm, had been refused by MKDCC , the chief reasons being that it was in contravention of MK Policy S10 , and that its location on the far borders of the village was considered as not sustainable. However the developers who had previously submitted an application for 51 houses at the Equestrian centre had re submitted their application, despite the previous one being refused.</i></p>
October/November	<p>WG preparing the final submission report together with the accompanying Consultation Statement and the Conditions Statement</p>

Notes: PC – Parish Council; WG – Working group; OP – Open Parish Council meeting; MKC – Milton Keynes Council planning dept; MKDCC - Milton Keynes Development Control Committee; HNP – Hanslope Neighbourhood Plan

5. First Open Meetings

The Open Meetings of Hanslope Parish Council held in the large hall of the village hall in 2016 on 17 April and 18th October were advertised on the Village Notice Boards, in the parish newsletter and on the village website.

The first meeting informed residents about the Neighbourhood planning process and that as the first part of this process a village survey that was scheduled to be sent to all households in the early summer. It was also explained how the Neighbourhood Plan differed from the previous Parish Plan that had been completed in 2009.

The second meeting attended by well over 100 residents outlined the main results of the survey and how these would now begin to be woven into a Neighbourhood plan for Hanslope that would also have to take into account the large scale applications that were coming forward (e.g proposed Castlethorpe Rd development) and the rumours of others.

It was also explained how advice on the development of the plan was being provided by James Williamson and Diane Webber of MKC, and that using grant funding the services of a planning professional with experience in developing neighbourhood plans would be sought as required to advise on key issues.

Representatives of the Interim WG requested volunteers to join the group that reflected a cross section of residents required to develop a HNP that took account of the issues raised in the survey and all other representations. Following this meeting the WG to take forward the Neighbourhood plan was made up of the following:

Martin Palmer *

Dorothy Courtman*

Eileen Price*

Simon Proctor*

Jeanette Green*

Richard Green *

Andy Grout

Paul Everington

Don Cook

Daran Scarlett

Jon Rawcliffe

Tom Thornewill

Note * - also members of the Parish Council

6. Village Survey

The comments from the first Open meeting were then used to help construct a Village Survey. The survey had two elements; the Neighbourhood Plan and some Parish Plan and other questions designed to give the parish council guidance on improvement of village facilities and other issues that concerned residents particularly health facilities, public transport, highways/traffic and environmental, which it was believed were important to the development of policies in the plan. Taking advice from experts in surveys and statistics a pilot survey was carried out in June 2016 and the final survey form subsequently amended to take account of the lessons learnt

The survey was conducted from the week commencing 24 July 2016 and a three week period was allowed for the completion and return of questionnaires in sealed envelopes. A paper copy of the questionnaire was delivered to every household in the parish with advertisements and links to the survey electronically placed on the village website. In 2016 there were about 970 households in the parish (this had grown as a result of small 'infilling' developments in the village/parish from the National Census in 2011 which indicated that there were approximately 940 households).

There were 417 valid responses. These were independently analysed and a report of the findings prepared by Catherine Mc Nulty (an independent analyst with links to the Open University and who was not a resident of the parish or linked to it in any way, who was appointed by the PC to carry out the work)

The results of the survey were published and are still available on the village website. From a key neighbourhood planning perspective of the 417 valid responses received, the following important views emerged:

250 respondents were reluctant to see any further residential development in the village/parish

167 respondents were of the opinion that some development was justified, but of these 110 did not believe that any significant large scale residential development should take place.

7. Development of the Plan

The expanded 'Working group' met on 3 November 2016 discuss the whole philosophy about developing a HNP in the face of the large scale planning applications (for the 150 house Castlethorpe Road site and the 141 house Longstreet Road site), that had appeared while the village survey and the analysis of it were being undertaken. It was agreed to proceed but to seek advice from contacts in MKC and/private planning consultants about how the plan could handle these large scale outline planning applications if they were approved.

The development of the neighbourhood plan continued into 2017 and 2018, having to take account of the above and other large scale planning applications that continued to appear, largely a through developers taking opportunistic advantage of the MKC problems with its 5 year land supply. During the course of the development of the plan only one of the developers behind these applications made any attempt to engage with the neighbourhood planning process for Hanslope, of which all were well aware was underway.

In spite of these frustration and misgiving as about the whole neighbourhood planning process, as a result of which the resolution of issues pertinent to the development of the plan caused serious delays in the process, the Working group stuck to their task (as detailed in the Section 4 the Dateline of Events). The work in preparing the plan and the subsequent 4 drafts of the initial plan and the 8 drafts of the Pre Submission was divided amongst members of the working group, advised at various times with links to James Williamson and Diane Webber of MKC and the independent planning consultant Neil Homer.

At all stages in the development of the plan, both residents of the village and other stakeholders were kept informed of progress through the four Parish Council Open meetings held in the two years from 2017, at which comments were sought, and through articles in the Parish Council newsletters. The Working group and the Parish Council also made it clear that it was willing to take representations from residents and other stakeholders on any issues that could affect the development of the Hanslope Neighbourhood plan.

8. Parish Council Public Consultation

When the parish council's independent advisors and MKC were satisfied that the draft Pre-Submission HNP was satisfactory, then as required the Parish Council ran a Public Consultation from the end of June to 12 August 2018

It was decided that that in view of the existing plans from developers and the possibility of others (*e.g. at an Extraordinary PC meeting on 17 April 2018 – it was reported that the outline proposal for the Equestrian centre that surfaced in July 2017, had been expanded to a proposal for the erection of 51 dwellings*), the management of the public consultation should be entrusted to an independent 'Consultation Co-ordinator'

Consequently Sophie Jamieson (who did not reside in the parish) was appointed as the independent 'Consultation Cordinator' for the Pre- Submission plan, to oversee and provide an independent report to the WG on the outcome of the consultation.

The Parish Council made arrangements for publishing the availability of the online 'e-version' of the of the Pre Submission plan for consultation on PC notice boards, the village web site and the PC newsletter (to be distributed to all households in the Parish in late June). A small number (60) hard copies were also produced for distribution for those that requested one, but as expected the large majority of those that replied utilised the online 'e version'.

A letter together with an online link to the Pre submission plan was also sent to the 28 statutory bodies as advised by MKC.

Following the consultation, the Pre Submission plan was amended where appropriate to produce the final Submission plan that was approved by the Parish Council to be passed to MKC.

9. The Evidence Base

A. Village Survey

The village survey questionnaire and the full analysis of the results of the survey are available on the Hanslope village web site and as advised it is not thought necessary to reproduce them in full in this document.

The main outcomes of the survey that the parish council and the Working group thought most relevant to the development of a Hanslope Neighbourhood plan were:

1. In response to Question 3.1: *What do you value most about living in the village/parish of Hanslope.* Of those that replied 98% thought that living in a small established village community in a rural village environment was 'extremely or very important to them'.

2. In response to Question 3.2: *How would you describe your attitude to future residential development in the village/parish.* The large majority of residents , 60% of those that replied did not want to see large scale residential development in the village/parish, other than refurbishment and renewal. For many this was because it was felt that the existing infrastructure of social facilities (e.g. health care, schools) and roads both within the village/parish and those linking the village/parish to the surrounding area would struggle to cope with any increase in the population of the village/parish. Any such development would it was also felt potentially damage and put greater pressure on the rural environment.
3. The remaining 40% of the residents of residents in response to Question 3.2, were agreeable to further residential development in the village /parish, but of these 66% were only agreeable to small developments of either one or small numbers of houses on available sites or small estates of 5 to 10 houses on appropriate sites. Of the remainder 28% made no further comment while only 6% (representing 10 replies) were in favour of significant residential development nearby the village or in other parts of the parish).
4. In response to Question 3.3 about: *How concerned they would be about the impact of future residential housing development on the village /parish.* Of the 408 who responded when commenting on specific issues:
 - a) 98% expressed concern about the impact on the environment (e.g. flooding, drainage, biodiversity etc)
 - b) 95% were greatly concerned to some concern about the impact on views around the village
 - c) 96% were greatly concerned to some concern about increased parking needs and the impact on the village
 - d) 99% were greatly concerned to some concern about increased traffic and congestion
 - e) 98% were greatly concerned to some concern about adequate infrastructure (e.g. schools, roads, water, sewage)
 - f) 99% were greatly concerned to some concern about the pressure on school places
 - g) 99% were greatly concerned to some concern about pressure on the doctors surgery.

B. Response to the Public Consultation

1. Of the 28 statutory bodies contacted, nine replied that they had no comments, these were:

British Gas

The Canals and Rivers Trust

Highways England

Marine Management Organisation

SSE Group

Western Power

MK Council of Faiths

Wood PLC on behalf of the National Grid

Network Rail

No response was received from the others bar Natural England which submitted some comments addressed in point 5 below

2. The only replies of more than a few words were received from those representing the developers and potential developers of sites within the parish on which applications had been lodged to build 50 houses or more. Of which during the development of the plan two had received outline planning permission – Castlethorpe Road and Long Street, and two had outline planning permission refused – Equestrian Centre and Cuckoo Hill Farm. These were:

Mark Harris. Bidwells -on behalf of Davidsons Developments (*the Long Street Road 141 house application*)

James Payner. Sherwell Drakes Fobs -representing clients (*believed to be the 50 house Cuckoo Hill application*)

Jennifer Smith. Smith Jenkins - on behalf of McCann Homes (*the 51 house Equestrian Centre application*)

Emily Bishop. Bloor Homes (*the 150 house Castlethorpe Road application*)

The comments made in these letters addressed in point 5 below.

In addition Councillor Simon Proctor (who had been a member of the Working Group but stood down in 2017, due to a conflict of interest as he was professionally involved with the land owner of the Long Street site), made various helpful comments to improve the plan and the development of this Consultation Statement which have been addressed.

3. In addition shorter replies were received from two individuals with comments on the quality of the maps within the Pre Submission plan (Lawrence Wilson a chartered town planner and WYG Environmental Planning) – these were addressed in the final Submission plan with better maps.

4. Finally only four replies were received from village residents:

Mrs Sue Nash – who was looking for greater clarity in the plan on village boundaries (addressed in the Submission plan with updated maps)

Katherine Crowsley – pointing out that local churches could provide community facilities and that there should be clearer emphasis on social rented and affordable housing (addressed in the Submission plan in Section 5 Vision and Section 6 Implementation – Development Criteria)

Mr and Mrs Noakes – wanted clearer emphasis on issues with the local road network, cycle routes, footpaths and parking (addressed in the Submission plan in Section 5, Policy HAN 9 and Section 6 Implementation – Development Management - Traffic)

Sarah Evans – asked mostly for further information on seven specific points, but also suggested that the plan should include the purchase of land (by the Parish Council?) for additional community facilities and footpaths (addressed in the Submission plan in Section 5 Policy HAN 7 and Policy HAN 9)

The few comments from residents of the parish/village on the Pre Submission plan was taken as a positive statement that the large majority supported it. This was reinforced at the Open Meeting of the Parish Council on 8 October 2018, at which representatives of the residents congratulated the Parish Council about the plan and urged all residents to vote in favour of it at the forthcoming referendum.

5. Major Comments and responses:

- a) Natural England – Made a number of comments, principally relating to Policy HAN9 and these have been reflected in the Submission Plan. Other comments on the Neighbourhood Area in relation to the bordering Salcey Forest SSSI have also been reflected in the Plan.
- b) Bidwells – Commented on the principle of the plan to allocate sites with outline planning permission established by the Sherington Neighbourhood Plan. As with the Sherington Neighbourhood Plan the allocation of these sites do not affect any reserved matters application that may be submitted in the usual way and applies to new or revised applications. Policy HAN2 has been amended to make its intention clearer. Comments were made on the role of Appendix 2 – Development Criteria and their application. These have now been incorporated into design policy. The design policies have also been amended to clarify their application in line with national policy, addressing comments made regarding their prescriptiveness on application.
- c) Sherwell Drake Fobs – Comments included references to the 2018 NPPF. The Submission Plan has been amended to demonstrate that it will be examined

under the 2012 NPPF and this is set out in more detail in the Basic Conditions Statement. The validity of the site selection process has also been challenged. The main purpose of Policy HAN2 is to guide the reserved matters applications for sites that already have outline planning permission and to establish planning policy context for new or revised applications, a principle adopted from the examination of the Sherington Neighbourhood Plan. It also supports the redevelopment of ancillary housing land within the defined development boundary at Site D and the policy has been amended to reflect this.

- d) Smith Jenkins – The validity of the site allocation was challenged. With the amendments to Policy HAN2 its purpose is only to support the redevelopment of Site D. Comments regarding an SEA were also made and an update on this matter has now been included in the Submission Plan. The Basic Conditions Statement deals with this matter in more detail.
- e) Bloor Homes – Comments were made in relation to the wording used for the proposed Local Green Space ii. The designation of the site as a Local Green Space will not affect the planning permission and terms of the S106 agreement.

C. Housing Sites Assessment

Assessment Criteria	HAN2 Site A - Land Opposite the Recreation Ground Off Castlethorpe Road
Site Capacity	150 Houses
Impact on Village Character and Facilities	Considerable Impact - Hanslope has about 1300 dwellings. Along with other development sites, this might take certain facilities, in particular the school and Doctors' Surgery, above capacity. Increased vehicular traffic in the village will add to the parking and congestion problems.
Site Access Arrangements	Vehicular access would be from the site onto Castlethorpe Road. Pedestrian access would be from the site onto the existing footpaths in Castlethorpe Road.
Access to facilities Pre-school, school, church, surgery and play areas in Recreation Ground	Vehicular access from the site via Castlethorpe Road to the facilities. Pedestrian access is also available via Castlethorpe Road then onto Longstreet Road, High Street or Gold Street.
Impact on the Landscape	The impact will be significant for the residents in Castlethorpe Road and Western Drive.

Assessment Criteria	HAN 2 Site B - Former Bus Garage – land off Longstreet Road at the junction with Castlethorpe Road.
Site Capacity	8 Houses
Impact on Village Character and Facilities	This small development will not have a major impact on the village or the facilities within. The owner of the site started work but has since halted the development temporarily. Hopefully work will resume in the near future.
Site Access Arrangements	Vehicular access would be from the site onto Longstreet Road. Pedestrian access would be from the site onto the existing footpath on Longstreet Road.
Access to facilities Pre-school, school, church, surgery and play areas in Recreation Ground	All facilities are within walking distance of the site using established footpaths. Vehicular access is onto Longstreet Road and then further onto Castlethorpe Road, Gold Street or High street.

Impact on the Landscape	This will have little or no impact as the site itself is already surrounded by houses.
-------------------------	--

Assessment Criteria	HAN2 Site C - Land that was formerly the Globe Public House car park, Longstreet.
Site Capacity	6 Houses
Impact on Village Character and Facilities	This development removes the car park to the Village Pub and could potentially result in parking on what is an already busy main road. Apart from the two houses which are very near to the footpath, there will be minimum impact.
Site Access Arrangements	Vehicular access will be from the site via the single access point onto Hartwell Road. Pedestrian access will be similar onto the existing established footpath.
Access to facilities Pre-school, school, church, surgery and play areas in Recreation Ground	All facilities can be accessed on foot. The centre of the village, where most facilities are located, is quite some distance away. This may result in increased vehicular traffic as the young and elderly might find the walking distance too far.
Impact on the Landscape	There will be very little impact as the majority of the proposed houses will be set back from the main highway.

Assessment Criteria	HAN2 Site D - Redundant Garage & Car Park Behind houses off Williams Close
Site Capacity	Up to 8 smaller "Care Bungalows"
Impact on Village Character and Facilities	This disused and abandoned piece of ground and garages would benefit from being used for Care Bungalows. Thames Valley Police would welcome this piece of land being used for the good of the community. At present it is a dumping ground for rubbish and is also frequented by drug dealers and vandals.
Site Access Arrangements	Vehicular and invalid carriage access would be from the site onto Williams Close. Pedestrian access would be similar.
Access to facilities	Vehicular and pedestrian access would be from the site onto Williams Close. There are well

Pre-school, school, church, surgery and play areas in Recreation Ground	established footpaths which lead to the village facilities.
Impact on the Landscape	There would be no impact on the village as this area is behind houses situated on Williams Close.

Assessment Criteria	HAN 2 Site E – L to the west of Longstreet Road Adjacent to Hales Folly Farm
Site Capacity	141 Houses
Impact on Village Character and Facilities	Considerable Impact - Hanslope has about 1300 dwellings. Along with the other development sites, this large development might take facilities, such as the school and the Doctor's Surgery, above capacity. Increased vehicular traffic in the village will cause parking and congestion problems.
Site Access Arrangements	Vehicular access would be from the site onto Longstreet Road via the exit near Williams Close. Pedestrian access would be via the same exit.
Access to facilities Pre-school, school, church, surgery and play areas in Recreation Ground	All facilities are within walking distance of the site using the established footpaths. Vehicular transport may be necessary to access the Pre-school which is situated in Newport Road. All vehicular traffic from the site would use the exit near Williams Close.
Impact on the Landscape	The visual impact will be significant for traffic coming from Hartwell Road on to Longstreet Road as the land rises towards Williams Close. Residents on the north west side of Williams Close will be affected by these houses. Hales Folly Farm suffers the greatest impact.
Traffic Concerns	The vehicular traffic from this site will feed onto Longstreet Road. 141 houses will have in the region of 200 cars, these will have to queue to leave the site. The volume of traffic on this stretch of road is already significant. Weekly flow up to 10,500 vehicles, in each direction, recorded by Speed Indicator Device. The Traffic Calming Island already causes long tailbacks at peak times. The proposed change of priority at the junction of Forest Road and Hartwell Road will make it difficult for traffic from Hartwell and residents of Hartwell Road to enter the near continuous line of traffic down Forest Road at peak flow. Pedestrians will find great difficulty crossing Forest Road. There is no pavement on the other side of Hartwell Road.

Hanslope Parish Council
12 November 2018