

## Hanslope Parish Neighbourhood Plan Review

Notes from the Steering Group meeting on 30 March 2023 at 19:00  
held on Zoom

### Members attending:

Eileen Price	Leani (ONEill Homer)	
Dorothy Courtman	Matthew (ONEill Homer)	Alison
Andrew	Ebba (ONEill Homer)	
Jackie Cass		
John Watson		

### Apologies:

Paul Everington  
Andrew Geary

### Notes:

Policy update from the MK City Plan conference (that the Parishes were not invited to attend) – the new city plan period will now be 2025 to 2050. There was a discussion as to whether we need to be more robust in our NP as MKC are planning to double the city population and are keen to develop the green spaces around the existing city boundary including north of the river Ouse extending to Hanslope Parish; concern was also expressed about the expansion of Hanslope Park as they have several current planning applications including a large increase in car parking implying a large increase in employees and traffic through the village but recognising we have no say in these proposals. The changes in the new city plan may have implications for the housing supply and §14 of the NPPF changing NP updates from 2 to 5 years. Leani/Matt/Ebba will contact MKC to confirm the §14 regulations and the impact on our review.

The group looked at the Action Plan policy modification list decided on at the last meeting:

- |          |   |
|----------|---|
| HAN1     | Parish and settlement boundaries showing sites granted planning permission. Malt Mill Farm development site needs to match the shading of the other sites, Matt will update this.   |
| HAN 2    | Contact the landowners of sites A & B to determine the current deliverability situation. Matt has prepared a draft letter for the SG to send to these landowners and it was agreed that Eileen would ask Gill (parish council clerk) to prepare and send these.   |
| HAN3 & 4 | Review latest MKC Landscape Character Assessment 2022 to identify and map additional key views (see also new policy HAN 10). This was prompted by a comment in a planning appeal*** report where the inspector noted a view from Newport Road that could be included in the NP ( <i>'The site may not be subject to a key view within the Hanslope Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2031 Made July 2019 (NP). However, the development would nevertheless be visible in views particularly from the north and east...While additional landscaping could partially screen views of</i> |

*the development from the neighbouring properties and open countryside as well as from the public footpath, the level of screening could not be guaranteed and would not fully mitigate the harm to the pattern of development and character of the area') and that several of the views shown in the made plan have housing built that blocks them. Leani will send an extract of the Landscape Character Assessment that is relevant to Hanslope and Eileen will ask the PC clerk to obtain two printed copies of the full assessment for the SG to look at and prepare a short report for agreement.*

HAN6 Ebba will provide the SG with minor wording changes to clarify the existing policy for the team to validate.

HAN7 Community Facilities: the team along with the PC and community need to review the suggested list sent by ONH (attached to these notes) JC keen to add **vii Allotments**. It was agreed that the NP should support proposals from the community for other types of sport and recreational facilities providing the design of the scheme and the resulting increase in use is appropriate and will not harm the amenities of adjoining residential properties.

HAN8 Need to look at possible further green space designation. Ebba will supply a template for assessing whether a particular space can be designated.

HAN10 A new policy to recognise the landscape gap between Hanslope village and Long Street and plan to prevent merging of the two settlements. This follows on from the Planning Inspector's report on the appeal for housing behind the Globe\* where she said, *"that proximity alone does not make Long Street part of the settlement of Hanslope. It is quite clear that both settlements grew organically distinct from one another and that there is a clear change in experience from the settlement of Hanslope to the settlement of Long Street, they are both distinct from each other and the experience of the villages 'on the ground' reflects this. The HVNP may describe the relationship between the two settlements as a 'cohesive entity' this may also refer to the reliance and relationship that the smaller Long Street has on the services of the larger Hanslope settlement like many villages, albeit separate and distinct, have a cohesive relationship."* She has the view that *"the settlements of Long Street and Hanslope are distinctly separate settlements and should be treated as such for the purpose of §72 of the Framework. It is noted that another Planning Appeal\*\* has also supported this view where in this appeal the gap between each of the settlements was determined as being within open countryside between the two settlements, rather than a gap within one settlement."*

The SG will review MK Landscape Character Assessment for relevance to this new policy.

Community consultation:

We considered various ways to consult the community following on from the Village Survey and decided that an open meeting held in the Community Hall was one way forward as we could display/exhibit what we have done/propose; hear residents views and answer questions.

We have a consultation period on the strategy for housing development and §14 of NPPF 2021, which currently states:

*In situations where the presumption (at paragraph 11d) applies to applications involving the provision of housing, the adverse impact of allowing development that conflicts with the neighbourhood plan is likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, provided all of the following apply:*

- a) the neighbourhood plan became part of the development plan two years or less before the date on which the decision is made;*
- b) the neighbourhood plan contains policies and allocations to meet identified housing requirement;*
- c) the local planning authority has at least a three year supply of deliverable housing sites (against its five year housing supply buffer as set out in paragraph 74); and*
- d) the local planning authority's housing delivery was at least 45% of that required over the previous three years.*

Originally it was thought our proposals on this could be ready for community consultation in April/May but given how busy May is already with the coronation and local elections the consultation period should be June/July.

Ebba will draft an introduction to use at the community consultation.

The community consultation will be advertised at the coronation celebrations on the big screen. There will be an exhibition of residents' photographs and other relevant materials organised by John and Alison as well as the advert on the big screen.

Update from MKC screening opinion is that we will not need a strategic environmental assessment (SEA)

Next meeting of whole team on Zoom Wednesday 26 April 2023 @ 19:00

Leani to send information for next meeting by 19 April 2023

\* Appeal reference APP/Y0435/W/21/3282446

\*\* Appeal reference APP/Y0435/W/17/3177851

\*\*\* Appeal reference APP/Y0435/W/21/3279163

**Policy HAN7: Community Facilities**

**A) The Neighbourhood Plan identifies the following as Community Facilities serving the Parish:**

- i. The village hall**
- ii. The recreation ground, including the Pavilion and adjacent Community Hall**
- iii. The children's play areas**
- iv. The church of St James, Hanslope Methodist Chapel and Hanslope Gospel Hall.**
- v. Hanslope Primary School**
- vi. The Doctor's Surgery**

**B) Proposals for other types of sports or recreational provision on existing open space will be supported provided the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss.**

Proposals to improve the viability of a community facility by way of the extension or partial redevelopment of existing buildings will be supported, provided the design of the scheme and the resulting increase in use is appropriate in design terms and will not harm the amenities of adjoining residential properties.

5.24 This policy complements the existing development plan policy by specifying land and buildings that meet the definition of community facilities in the Parish.

5.25 The need to protect and improve community facilities was a clear theme from the Parish Survey. There was, for example, a particular concern that both the excellent medical services provided through the existing medical practice should be maintained, as should the excellence of the village school (highlighted in recent OFSTED inspections).

5.26 The existing village hall, although an old building, is regarded as an excellent facility that has, through the efforts of the community, been steadily improved and modernised over the years. This upgrading needs to continue, including improving the existing storage facilities, leveraging in additional funding from development or grant sources wherever possible.

5.27 The policy also sets out that proposals for sports or recreational provisions on existing open space will be supported if the need for the proposed provision outweighs the loss of open space in accordance with Local Plan policy L2.