

Initial Parish Consultation – Feedback Report

Published by the Neighbourhood Development Order Steering Group

26 May 2021

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to provide you with feedback on what you told us in the Initial Parish Consultation, to explain how we are responding to what you have told us with new proposals, and to confirm the next steps of the process.

ABOUT THE CONSULTATION

The consultation was carried out in two stages between 19 November 2020 and 28 March 2021. Residents were invited to comment on the draft of the Neighbourhood Plan and a set of development proposals.

Neighbourhood Plan Policies	Development Proposals
BCH1 – New Surgery	The New Housing
BCH3 – School Improvements	The New Surgery
BCH4 – Community Facilities	The Allotments and Cemetery
BCH5 – Design Principles in Burcot	The Village Hall
BCH6 – Design Principles in Clifton Hampden	
BCH7 – Assets of Community Value	
BCH8 – Green Infrastructure	
BCH9 – Local Landscape Character	
Implementation	
Other Policies and Issues	

WHAT YOU TOLD US

Summary Statistics

A total of 123 responses were received representing 230 residents, up from 93 responses representing 176 residents at the end of the first phase of the consultation in December 2020.

75% (172) of those represented were from Clifton Hampden, 25% (58) from Burcot.

Across the parish:

- 59% (136) of those represented support or strongly support the proposals,
- 33% (77) are against or strongly against
- 8% (17) are neutral.

And Clifton Hampden and Burcot separately:

Clifton Hampden			Burcot		
Support or Strongly Support	Neutral	Against or Strongly Against	Support or Strongly Support	Neutral	Against or Strongly Against
53% (92)	8% (13)	39% (67)	76% (44)	7% (4)	17% (10)

Reason for Scoring

From your responses, it was possible to deduce the *main* reason for the scoring that you gave.

Top 3 reason given by those supporting	% of those represented	Top 3 reasons given by those against	% of those represented
Well designed scheme	29% (67)	Impact on Green Belt	13% (31)
Sustains the amenities	14% (33)	More Information Needed	5% (11)
The parish must grow	10% (22)	Process and governance	5% (12)

The Surgery

Support for retaining a GP surgery within the parish on a new site is overwhelming. 74% (172) agree that a new surgery is needed, 10% (24) disagree, 15% (34) did not express a view or needed more information. The number of residents who agree that a new surgery is needed outnumbers those who don't agree by a ratio of more than 7:1.

Of note was that many of those who are against the proposals overall and most of those who were neutral none the less agreed that a new surgery is needed.

Housing

Support for new housing within the parish is strong. 70% (161) agree that new housing is needed, 16% (37) oppose new housing, and 14% (32) did not express a view, were unsure, or needed more information. The number of residents agreeing that new housing is required outnumbered those who disagree by a ratio of more than 4:1.

Of note firstly was that some of those who are against the proposals overall and most of those who were neutral none the less agreed that some housing is needed. And secondly that the percentage of those who oppose new housing (14%) has remained substantially unchanged from levels reported in the 2014 survey, when 16% expressed the view that no new homes were needed.

Most comments made by respondents were about housing.

- **Housing Numbers and Types.** Some residents felt that the number of houses proposed was too high. Many commented on the proposed mix of housing types:
 - There should be proportionately more 1,2,& 3 bedroom houses.
 - The need for accommodation on a single floor such as single floor apartments or bungalows for elderly residents is not being met.
 - The number of Affordable Homes (e.g. shared ownership or social housing for rent) is too high
- **The Allotments Site.** Many residents whether supportive, neutral or opposed expressed concerns about the proposals for the Allotments site, e.g.:
 - Too close to Watery Lane properties
 - Should not have been extended into the field north of the current allotments
 - Risk of being overlooked
 - Loss of views onto open countryside
 - Loss of quiet enjoyment
 - Loss of rural feel of Watery Lane
 - Risk of flooding
 - Traffic concerns at the road access point shared with the village hall, surgery, new parking.
 - Whether the proposed 'Kiss and Drop' arrangements were workable in practice.

A number of residents offered ideas to improve the layout on the Allotments site. A common theme was increasing the separation between new and existing houses.

- **The Paddock Site.** Many residents were supportive of the layout, look and feel of the scheme on the Paddock site. A few expressed concerns such as proximity; risk of being overlooked; loss of views; flooding; access off the A415.
- **Housing Style.** There were mixed views on housing style. Some felt the designs shown were too modern, others not modern enough. Some expressed the view that the houses on the Allotments site should be styled individually, reflecting the character of the existing houses in Watery Lane.

The Allotments and the Cemetery. 46% (106) support the proposals to retain the allotments and provide new cemetery space. 11% (25) oppose. 43% (99) did not express a view or required more information. The number of residents supporting the proposals to retain the allotments and provide new cemetery space outnumbered those against by a ratio of more than 4:1.

The Village Hall. 51% (117) support the proposals to upgrade the village hall. 11% (25) oppose. 38% (88) did not express a view or required more information. The number of residents supporting the proposals to upgrade the village hall outnumbered those against by a ratio of more than 4:1.

The School. 38% (88) agreed with the draft Neighbourhood Plan policies to improve or extend the school. 7% (16) disagreed. 55% (126) did not express a view, were unsure, or required more information. The number of residents agreeing the policies for the school outnumbered those who did not by a ratio of more than 5:1.

Environmental Issues. A number of residents expressed views on environmental issues. Their comments were generally made across the draft policies for Green Infrastructure (BCH 8) and Local Landscape Character (BCH 9), and the proposals for new housing. Of those who commented on with BCH 8 and BCH 9, about 65% (78) agreed, 26% (31) disagreed and 8% (10) required more information. Those who disagreed appeared from the text of their responses to be concerned not with the policies themselves, but that the development proposals were not compliant with them. Our reading of this is that the policies themselves are widely supported.

Reasons given by residents for commenting that the proposals were not compliant included:

- Significant harm to the Green Belt with no very special circumstances to justify
- Designs must be more eco-friendly
- Concern on the impact of the proposals on bio-diversity

Parking. Many residents expressed concerns about whether the scheme delivered enough new parking.

The New Loo. Views on the proposed loo were sharply divided. Some see it as essential, whilst others were strongly opposed.

Clifton Hampden as a Visitor Attraction. A number of residents expressed the view that, based on the experience of Summer 2020, Clifton Hampden is already a visitor attraction causing significant additional pressures on parking, and that no further steps should be taken through the scheme to pursue such an objective.

Footpath and Cyclepath links between Burcot and Clifton Hampden. A few residents expressed the view that the scheme should aim to improve the link between Burcot and Clifton Hampden for pedestrians and cyclists, away from the A415.

Future Development.

- A number of residents expressed concerns that these proposals could set a precedent for further development on the two sites and more widely, and that it should be an explicit objective of the scheme and its legal framework to include safeguards against this.
- A number of residents expressed the view that the proposals do not do enough to safeguard against infill development in Burcot.
- A few residents expressed the view that the proposals don't offer enough for residents of Burcot, and that some development in Burcot should be considered.

Implementation

35% (82) agreed with the proposed implementation plans. 7% (15) disagreed. 64% (148) did not express a view or required more information. The number of residents agreeing the proposals for implementation outnumbered those who disagreed by a ratio of more than 5:1.

The consultation itself. The quality and volume of the feedback received is evidence that residents, whether for, neutral or against, have taken a great deal of care in preparing their responses using the information available and contributing to a data set that is rich in detail. A number of residents expressed concerns with the consultation process, and the lack of information to form a view on some aspects.

Governance. A number of residents expressed concerns about the governance of the project. These have been addressed separately by the Parish Council.

WHAT WE ARE DOING ABOUT IT

The Revised Scheme

The Steering Group are now developing a revised scheme:

- A significant downward shift in the size of houses towards 1, 2 and 3 bedrooms, with most available as market housing.
- To include single floor accommodation arranged in bungalows and apartments.
- A major redesign of the Allotments reflecting the smaller footprint required and reducing the impact on neighbouring properties.
- A reconfiguration of the Paddock site to reduce the impact on neighbouring properties, particularly the risk of being overlooked.

The following features of the current proposals will be retained:

- Use of both sites, with the Surgery, smaller housing, additional parking, Allotments and Cemetery on the Allotments Site, and larger houses on the Paddock Site.
- Some Affordable Housing (but a lower number than the 10 currently proposed).
- Village Hall Improvements

The following feature remains under consideration:

- The new loo

We are also considering, as part of options for the scheme and related settlement with the landowner, and in order to address concerns about future development, arrangements for the ownership of undeveloped land that might be acquired from the Gibbs Estate through this scheme, on the principle that the best way for the community to influence or prevent future development on

land is to own it. Examples of this are Watery Lane and the garages by the Old School Yard, and the Village Hall car park.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

We will now hold a series of meetings:

- 'Q&A' sessions open to all residents. Each meeting will be for an hour and, in order to allow everyone present a reasonable opportunity for their questions to be aired, each meeting will be limited to 10 people. Enough meetings will be held for everyone who wishes to do so to attend one meeting.
- Once we have drafted an option or options for a revised scheme, and in accordance with the undertakings given at the workshops on 5 April 2021, we plan to hold two design workshops (one for the Paddock site, one for the Allotments site) with those residents most directly impacted, to hear their views on the option(s) for a revised layout on each site and explore what further improvements might be made. We will then invite the community as a whole to do the same through the second Parish Consultation.
- Two meetings, open to all, to discuss and to explore concerns and discuss ideas about:
 - Environmental issues such as eco-performance, biodiversity, and visual impact
 - Parking and access

These meetings will be held face to face after 21st June, Covid-19 permitting. They will be held in the Church until the Village Hall is no longer required for vaccinations, which we understand to be late July.

Please visit the 'Workshops and Meetings' page on the website for dates, times and how to register.

These meetings are in addition to the Annual Village Meeting to be arranged by the Parish Council.

Second Parish Consultation

We plan to hold the second, non statutory, parish consultation on the revised proposals, over 6 weeks in September/October 2021 starting with an open event in the Village Hall. That will be followed by the statutory 'Pre-Submission' consultation managed by SODC in early 2022, then public examination by an inspector leading up to a Referendum in mid 2022.

Additional Information Updates

Over the next few weeks, the website will be updated to include details of meetings and workshops, and updated versions of the papers already published, reflecting the outcome of the consultation and new information:

- Overview of Project and Community Engagement Timelines
- Housing Numbers and Types
- The Surgery
- A new paper on the future ownership of Estate land

Thank you again

Giles Baxter OBE

Chair

Neighbourhood Development Order Steering Group

gileshlbaxter@btinternet.com

Notes on the Analysis Process

Sensitivity Check

Respondents were invited to say how many residents lived at their property, and how many of these were represented in their response. The statistics in this report use the number of residents represented for quantitative analysis. However we also wanted to check whether using the number of responses for quantitative analysis would have returned a different result.

Based on the number of responses (total 123):

- 59% (72) of those represented support or strongly support the proposals,
- 33% (41) are against or strongly against
- 8% (10) are neutral.

These results are identical to the method based on the numbers of residents represented.

We also wanted to check whether the results were affected because we accepted responses from those who are resident here and those who own residential property in the parish but are not resident, and from residents of all ages. To do so we tested what the outcome of the referendum, in which those under the age of 18 and/or not resident in the parish are not eligible to vote, might be if residents voted along the same lines as their responses. Based on our collective knowledge of the parish and its residents, we estimated the number of residents represented in each response who are likely to be eligible to vote in a referendum in 2022.

We estimated:

- 159 of those represented would be eligible to vote
- 65% (103) would vote yes
- 35% (56) would vote no

For the purposes of this calculation, we assumed that the eligible residents who expressed a neutral view would not cast a vote.

We therefore concluded that the statistics for the overall level of support were not materially sensitive to the method (number represented, number responded, number eligible to vote in a referendum) used to generate them.

Code of Practice

This report has been prepared in accordance with guidance on how to release information safely as issued by the Information Commissioners' Office. Of particular note is the guidance that particular care must be taken that the identity and views of an individual, to whom an undertaking of confidentiality has been given, cannot be inferred by a 3rd party outside the Steering Group.

Analysis Team

The analysis was conducted by the members of the Steering Group 'The Data Processor', namely the 5 community members, the landowner, and the GP surgery partners representative. The Development Partner has sight of the responses as a member of the Steering group, and in the nominated role of 'Data Controller'. The Development Partner has not been involved in the analysis of responses.

Analysis Methodology

Respondents were invited to tell us in overall terms what they thought of the draft Neighbourhood Plan and development proposals, using this scale:

Strongly Support	Support	Neutral	Against	Strongly Against
------------------	---------	---------	---------	------------------

Respondents were invited to tell us why they scored as they did, to make general comments, and to comment on each section of the development proposals and draft Neighbourhood Plan

Development Proposals	Neighbourhood Plan Policies
The New Housing	BCH1 – New Surgery
The New Surgery	BCH3 – School Improvements
The Allotments and Cemetery	BCH4 – Community Facilities
The Village Hall	BCH5 – Design Principles in Burcot
	BCH6 – Design Principles in Clifton Hampden
	BCH7 – Assets of Community Value
	BCH8 – Green Infrastructure
	BCH9 – Local Landscape Character
	Implementation
	Other Policies and Issues

Some respondents sent their comments in letters and emails using their own format. The steering group generally found it straightforward to deduce how these responses should be scored, and to assign their comments against the most relevant section from the list above.

Residents from Watery Lane and the High Street who are most directly impacted by the development proposals were invited to attend workshops on 25th March. A number of those attending submitted comments on the proposals which have been also been taken into account in the analysis of their responses and preparation of this report.

Each section of each response was then summarised and put into an analysis spreadsheet, one row per response, along with the name, location (Burcot, Clifton Hampden), the number represented in the response, score, and an estimate of the number of those represented likely to be on the electoral roll.

Members of the Steering Group independently checked that the spreadsheet entries were a reflection of the text entries on response forms. Each member of the Steering Group also read every response form so as to come to their own view of the main themes emerging.

The combination of quantitative scoring and qualitative comments transferred into a single integrated document has provided the Steering Group with a rich data set from which to conduct both quantitative and qualitative analysis of the type reported in this document, for the scheme as a whole and for each individual element of it.

The Steering Group will not be publishing this document. This is because, in order to protect the identity of respondents and to respect the undertaking of confidentiality given, the content would have to be in large part redacted.

The Steering Group will prepare and include a thematic Consultation Statement with the Pre-Submission draft of the Neighbourhood Plan and Neighbourhood Development Order put forward for statutory consultation under Regulations 14 and 21.