



# Growth, Infrastructure & Housing Select Committee agenda

Date: Tuesday 5 July 2022

Time: 11.00 am

Venue: The Oculus, Buckinghamshire Council, Gatehouse Road, Aylesbury HP19 8FF

## Membership:

D Carroll (Chairman), A Baughan, N Brown, S Chapple, Q Chaudhry, I Darby, C Etholen, T Hogg, T Hunter-Watts, M Hussain, N Marshall, C Poll, S Rouse, D Town, S Wilson and P Brazier

## Webcasting notice

Please note: this meeting may be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the council's website. At the start of the meeting the chairman will confirm if all or part of the meeting is being filmed.

You should be aware that the council is a data controller under the Data Protection Act. Data collected during this webcast will be retained in accordance with the council's published policy.

Therefore by entering the meeting room, you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes. If members of the public do not wish to have their image captured they should ask the committee clerk, who will advise where to sit.

If you have any queries regarding this, please contact the monitoring officer at [monitoringofficer@buckinghamshire.gov.uk](mailto:monitoringofficer@buckinghamshire.gov.uk).

## Agenda Item

## Page No

- 1 Apologies for Absence/Changes in Membership**
- 2 Appointment of Vice-Chairman**
- 3 Declarations of Interest**

- 4 Minutes of the Previous Meeting** **3 - 10**  
That the minutes of the meetings held on 13<sup>th</sup> April and 18<sup>th</sup> May 2022 be confirmed as a correct record.
- 5 Call in of the decision on Proposed residential development at the site of the former Buckinghamshire County Council Sports and Social Club land taken at Cabinet on 7th June 2022** **11 - 46**

**Contributors:**

Mr Nick Graham, Service Director, Legal and Democratic Services  
Cllrs Anders Christensen and Susan Morgan  
Cllr John Chilver, Cabinet Member for Accessible Housing and Resources  
Mr Ian Thompson, Corporate Director, Planning, Growth and Sustainability  
Mr David Pearce, Capital Projects Performance Manager

**Supporting Papers:**

Call In request  
Call In notice  
Extract of Buckinghamshire Constitution detailing Call In Procedure

Cabinet report and appendices considered at Cabinet on 7<sup>th</sup> June 2022  
Draft Pre-Consultation Summary report

- 6 Date of Next Meeting**  
There is a joint meeting with the Communities and Localism Select Committee on 13<sup>th</sup> July 2022 at 10am in the Oculus.

If you would like to attend a meeting, but need extra help to do so, for example because of a disability, please contact us as early as possible, so that we can try to put the right support in place.

For further information please contact: Kelly Sutherland on 01296 383602, email [democracy@buckinghamshire.gov.uk](mailto:democracy@buckinghamshire.gov.uk).



# Growth, Infrastructure & Housing Select Committee

## Minutes

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GROWTH, INFRASTRUCTURE & HOUSING SELECT COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY 13 APRIL 2022 IN THE OCULUS, BUCKINGHAMSHIRE COUNCIL, GATEHOUSE ROAD, AYLESBURY HP19 8FF, COMMENCING AT 10.01 AM AND CONCLUDING AT 11.46 AM

### MEMBERS PRESENT

D Carroll, M Smith, T Hogg, M Bracken, N Brown, S Chapple, I Darby, C Poll and P Brazier

### OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

D Eggleton, L Michelson, K Sutherland, M Tett, G Williams and Cheston

### Agenda Item

#### 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/CHANGES IN MEMBERSHIP

Apologies were received from Cllrs Baughan, Chaudhry, Etholen, Hussain, Rouse and Town. Members noted that Cllr Peter Brazier would be substituting for Cllr Town for this meeting.

#### 2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

#### 3 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> February 2022 were confirmed as a correct record.

#### 4 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

The Select Committee had received two public questions.

Question from Mr Chadwick

*Could the Cabinet Member or Officers please confirm that all relevant policies within the new Buckinghamshire Local Plan will contribute towards the urgent goals of reducing carbon emissions, and adapting to the impacts of climate change. Would you agree that these considerations cut across many areas of policy, including, in particular, housing, transport, and environment, but others, too - and thus that a coordinated and coherent approach across the piece is required? What structures and expertise are in place within the planning policy team to achieve this?*

*In particular, given the significant number of new homes to be built, will you be looking to put in place policies to require Passivhaus (zero carbon) standards of energy efficiency by early in the*

*Plan period, and if not, why not?*

Cllr Gareth Williams, Cabinet Member for Planning and Regeneration provided a response, making the following main points:

- The Council has a statutory and local obligation to mitigate and to adapt to climate change and reduce carbon. The Council has a climate change policy aiming to achieve a net zero carbon position in Buckinghamshire by 2050. Climate change will be an integral part of the Local Plan and will be embedded into the policies therein.
- It was acknowledged that this is cross-cutting and a Cabinet Member has been appointed to oversee the climate change agenda across the Council. The Planning Policy team will work closely with the environment and climate change team to produce robust and effective Local Plan policies.
- There is a climate change lead officer within the Planning Policy team who will liaise with the Council's environmental specialists on urban design, ecology, the natural environment, arboriculture and other relevant disciplines.
- The Local Plan for Buckinghamshire is in the early stages of production. The plan provides us with the opportunity to develop a range of new policies that, collectively, will reduce carbon dioxide emissions and encourage renewable and low carbon energy in Buckinghamshire.
- At the national level, the government introduced "The Future Homes Standard" in 2019 which will replace the current Building Regulations. It proposes that from 2025 new homes built to the Future Homes Standard will have carbon dioxide emissions at least 75% lower than those built to the current Building Regulation standards.

Question from Mr Thawley

*Given that skills relating to the net-zero transition in construction will play an ever-increasing role in the economy, how is the council supporting local businesses to acquire these skills, either by ensuring that the relevant training is provided and accessible, or by supporting the growing market? To this end, given that we have to date been unable to require developments to do more than meet the minimum requirements set by government through planning, will the council commit to ensuring the developments it instigates itself (through Consilio Property, for instance or on council-owned land in Stoke Mandeville), will be required to be built to zero-carbon standards rather than vaguely promising to be 'energy efficient'?*

Cllr Gareth Williams, Cabinet Member for Planning and Regeneration provided a response, making the following main points:

- With circa 5000 people on the waiting list for social housing, the Council has to be mindful of the provision of affordable homes alongside the zero-carbon commitment that the Council has made.
- This means inevitably that there will be a tension between affordability of a development and climate change goals.

The Chairman thanked the Cabinet Member for his responses to the public questions.

## **5 CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE**

The Chairman thanked officers in housing who had delivered Member Briefings on the Homelessness Strategy where members of the Committee had been able to provide their feedback.

The Chairman also reported that Cllr Chris Poll had presented the Member Engagement in Planning review report to Cabinet on 1<sup>st</sup> March and all six recommendations had been accepted.

## 6 BUCKINGHAMSHIRE LOCAL PLAN UPDATE

The Chairman welcomed Cllr Gareth Williams, Cabinet Member for Planning and Regeneration, Darran Eggleton, Head of Service, Planning, Policy and Compliance and John Cheston, Planning Policy Manager to the meeting. The Cabinet Member highlighted the following main points:

- There continued to be uncertainty in connection with anticipated changes to the planning framework following the appointment of Michael Gove as the new Secretary of State in Autumn 2021. It was now being suggested that any changes to planning might be included in the Levelling Up and Regeneration bill.
- Eleven local authorities had chosen to suspend the development of their Local Plans as a result of this uncertainty, but Buckinghamshire was continuing to work on the development of the Local Plan and officers were concentrating on elements of work that they hope would not need to be revised.
- The principal workstream to date focussed on identifying brownfield sites. On 6<sup>th</sup> December 2021 a second call for brownfield sites had been launched and a further 47 sites had been proposed to date. A lot of brownfield sites had already been developed and whilst it would be preferable to concentrate future development on brownfield, it was recognised that this would not provide all the necessary space required to meet the government housing numbers.
- An Attitudes Survey had been undertaken to enable members of the public to provide feedback on their key priorities for the Local Plan at an early stage. There had been 3439 responses to the survey, which was a positive sign of engagement.
- The two main elements of the Local Plan – the key policies and the nominated sites, would be subject to consultation with the public and other stakeholders, such as Town and Parish Councils.
- It was noted that until the new Local Plan was finalised the current Wycombe Local Plan and Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan would remain in place.

The Chairman invited members' questions and in response to questions and during subsequent discussions, the following main points were noted:

- In connection with a question about the survey response, the Cabinet Member advised that he had seen the provisional results of the survey. Early responses had come from an older demographic so there was a communications push on social media to try and engage with younger residents too. The geographical spread of response would also be analysed. The Cabinet Member was happy to share the survey response with the Select Committee shortly.

### **ACTION: Cllr Gareth Williams**

- A Member expressed concern that areas in the south of the county were currently vulnerable to speculative planning applications. The Cabinet Member advised that the five-year land supply numbers would shortly be released which would provide some protection, alongside the protection already afforded by the Green Belt and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
- It was noted that the timescale for completion of the Local Plan in light of potential Government changes was very challenging. The Cabinet Member would share an updated timeframe for Local Plan delivery at his next update to the Committee.
- The Cabinet Member was also asked how Members could get more involved with the Local Plan. In response, the Cabinet Member reported that there was a Member Local Plan Working Group which included the Chairs of all the Council's Planning Committees and others who were feeding views into the Local Plan. The Working Group had consulted with previous Cabinet Members of the legacy District Councils about their

experiences of producing a Local Plan and had also held sessions considering Density, Design Codes and Environmental and Climate Change. All 147 members would have the opportunity to comment at the consultation stages and the Cabinet Member was open to discussions with any Members who had particular expertise.

- National guidelines for environmental standards in new home building would be followed although there was flexibility to determine if higher standards should be applied in Buckinghamshire. The environmental impact would have to be balanced against the affordability of the housing and Council would agree the policies around this.
- It was highlighted that the Statement of Community Involvement was difficult to locate on the Council's website. Officers agreed to look into this.
- There was a discussion around the number of Town and Parish Councils that have agreed a Neighbourhood Plan and what influence these might have over the Local Plan for Buckinghamshire. It was reported 40% of Town and Parish Councils in the county had a designated neighbourhood area and there were currently 30 Neighbourhood Plans in place and 38 more were in development, including 4 which were reviews of existing plans. With regard to planning decisions, whilst Neighbourhood Plans would be taken into consideration, the Buckinghamshire Local Plan would take priority.
- Members asked what more could be done to promote Neighbourhood Plans to Town and Parish Councils as the take up seemed very low. The Cabinet Member explained that regular planning forums were held with Town and Parish Councils and Neighbourhood Plans were also promoted via Buckinghamshire Association of Local Council (BALC) forums as well. Some Parishes were perhaps nervous about the relevance of Neighbourhood Plans and they did involve a lot of work. A Member commented that 6 of his 7 Parishes had Neighbourhood Plans and he believed that this had prevented some unwanted developments.
- The Cabinet Member reported that 1200 people had responded to the consultation which Chesham Town Council ran when preparing their Neighbourhood Plan. This level of engagement was good to see and also helped to inform Buckinghamshire Council about what people want to see locally and could help to add local texture to the Local Plan.
- A Member commented that Neighbourhood Plans helped to preserve areas of character and could consider smaller elements such as grass verges and shop fronts which can really contribute to the local community.
- Darran Eggleton commented that there was a team to support the development of Neighbourhood Plans and he would encourage Town and Parish Councils to be proactive and work towards this, as a Neighbourhood Plan would help when planning decisions are being taken.
- A Member asked about sustainability issues and commented that there were lots of innovative ways that concrete and more natural materials could be used in developments. The Cabinet Member advised that the Local Plan would not be too prescriptive about what materials should be used as there were pros and cons for different construction styles and there could be recurrent costs with certain materials that would also need to be taken into account.
- In response to concerns raised about planning applications around Iver and Wexham in the South of the County, the Cabinet Member advised that there had been lots of discussions with Colne Valley Park, local members and the MP and permission for development in the Green Belt was only granted in exceptional circumstances.

The Chairman thanked the Cabinet Member for Planning and Regeneration and his officer team for attending the meeting.

The Chairman welcomed Cllr Martin Tett, Leader of the Council and Lisa Michelson, Service Director, Economic Growth and Regeneration to the meeting.

The Chairman invited the Leader to highlight the key points from the report on Levelling Up and the following main points were noted:

- The Government had stood on a 'Levelling Up' platform at the 2019 general election but the policy was not clearly defined in terms of delivery and the Covid 19 pandemic has delayed its development.
- In September 2021, Michael Gove replaced Robert Jenrick as the Secretary of State for the renamed Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities and in February 2022, the Levelling Up White Paper was published, setting out a broad range of ways in which the levelling up agenda would be taken forward.
- The White Paper sets out four key outcomes – Boost productivity, pay, jobs and living standards; Spread opportunities and improve public services; restore a sense of community, local pride and belonging and Empower local leaders and communities.
- The policy is underpinned by five mutually reinforcing pillars, namely: reshaping Central Government decision making; Empower local decision making; The role of data, monitoring and evaluation; Transparency and Accountability and 12 medium term missions.
- Reshaping Government decision making was important to note, as previously Government has evaluated projects in terms of capital return which was biased towards projects based in the South and South East of the country.
- The 12 missions are very broad in scope and are to be delivered by 2030. The 12 missions encompass the following: Employment; Research and Development; Transport; Broadband; Education; Health inequalities; Skills training; Crime; Home ownership; Wellbeing; Pride in place and Devolution.
- Devolution is about devolving more decision making to local government but it has been difficult to pin down exactly what this means. The White Paper outlines a Devolution Framework with three tiers. Buckinghamshire currently lies in Tier 2, with Tier 3 only open to areas with directly elected Mayors. The Leader commented that he believed that Buckinghamshire could be categorised as Tier 2 plus.
- Buckinghamshire Council had not been awarded a county deal as part of the first tranche but the Leader would continue to lobby for inclusion in future rounds. However, it was noted from the first tranche of devolution deals that no additional funding new funding was attached. Buckinghamshire was in a strong position with a well-developed Growth deal proposal and in the meantime, Cabinet was considering how the Council could address levelling up issues locally.

The Chairman invited Members' questions. In response to questions and during the subsequent discussions, the following main points were noted:

- A Member questioned what the Council could do to address inequalities when Government did not see Buckinghamshire as a priority at this time. The Leader commented that the global financial situation, which was now exacerbated by the war in Ukraine was contributing to a cost of living crisis. The Council's Helping Hands scheme had received £2.4m of government funding to help to support the most vulnerable and the Council was also currently administering the £150 Council Tax rebate. Additional support measures were currently being considered.
- The White Paper was trying to address long term structural issues. Although a county deal might not deliver substantial new funding it could provide more freedoms and flexibilities for the Council which would be advantageous.
- The Council was also using one off Capital investment in town centre regeneration for example to support job creation and pride in place and the Council could also consider

partnership working with the private sector to deliver more transformative projects.

- A Member commented that he would like to see more innovation with regards to the Council raising its own finance and more opportunities for the Council to invest its reserves more effectively. The Leader commented that the Council was financially strong due to strong governance and a prudent approach but agreed that there were limits in terms of how money could be raised.

The Chairman thanked the Leader and Lisa Michelson for attending the meeting and answering members' questions.

## **8 WORK PROGRAMME**

The Chairman invited members to suggest any possible topics for consideration for the Select Committee's future work programme.

## **9 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

14<sup>th</sup> July 2022 at 10am – to be confirmed.



# Buckinghamshire Council

## Growth, Infrastructure & Housing Select Committee

### Minutes

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GROWTH, INFRASTRUCTURE & HOUSING SELECT COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY 18 MAY 2022 IN THE OCULUS, BUCKINGHAMSHIRE COUNCIL, GATEHOUSE ROAD, AYLESBURY HP19 8FF.

#### MEMBERS PRESENT

D Carroll, T Hunter-Watts, Q Chaudhry, T Hogg, S Rouse, N Brown, S Chapple, I Darby, M Hussain, C Etholen, C Poll, D Town, N Marshall, and S Wilson

#### OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

D Dhillon

#### Agenda Item

##### 1 APOLOGIES

Apologies had been received from Councillor A Baughan.

##### 2 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

It was proposed by Councillor C Poll and seconded by Councillor D Town.

**Resolved:** that Councillor D Carroll be elected Chairman of the Growth, Infrastructure and Housing Select Committee for the ensuing year.

This page is intentionally left blank



## Call-in Request Form

<b>Decision title:</b>	Proposed residential development at the site of the former Buckinghamshire County Council Community Sports and Social Club Land
<b>Decision reference no:</b>	Cabinet meeting held on 7 June 2022
<b>Decision taker:</b>	Cabinet
<b>Date decision made:</b>	7 June 2022

### **Reasons for the call-in:**

*Please provide supporting information on the reasons for your call-in request. Please limit your summary to no more than 1,000 words for this entire section. Grounds for a call-in request should relate to one of the following categories:*

- a. The decision has not been made in accordance with this Constitution, Council policies or Council procedures and processes;
- b. The decision is outside of the Council's policy framework or the budget approved by the Council;
- c. The decision is outside of the powers of the Council;
- d. The decision is unlawful

The callers-in requested that the decision made by Cabinet on 7 June 2022 in relation to the development of the Buckinghamshire County Council Sports & Social Club be called in for the following two reasons:

3.3 of the report to Cabinet does not address the option of a sale to a current residents group or the Parish Council. The site is listed as a community asset and I do not believe this fact has been adequately considered in the report or decision making process. Having met with a residents group last night there was not a proposal from residents in relation to 'gifting' the site. They have been asking for a meeting to discuss purchasing the site but this has been declined by Buckinghamshire Council. The basis of this option under 3.3 is therefore not representative of the options cabinet could or should have considered.

9.1. States that the results of a 'pre-planning consultation will be considered' before a decision is made. The result of that consultation was not included in the papers before cabinet and have yet to be published to either members or the public. Until the results of the pre-planning

<p>consultation are published I do not believe the decision to proceed with the development of the site can be considered Safe.</p> <p>I also not from the Stoke Mandeville Parish Council meeting minutes from the 25th of April 2022 that they were promised a meeting as a part of the consultation that then didn't take place rendering the promised consultation process incomplete.</p>	
<p><b>Desired outcome/alternative course of action sought:</b></p> <p>As detailed in the reasons for call-in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Request the Council to consider options of a sale to a current residents' group or the Stoke Mandeville Parish Council</li> <li>- That the Council undertake further consultation including meeting with the Stoke Mandeville Parish Council</li> <li>- That Cabinet awaits for the results of a pre-planning consultation to be published and considered before finalising any decision to proceed with the development of the site.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lead Member:</b> <i>(who will attend the meeting and be the main contact and spokesperson for this call-in request)</i></p>	<p><b>Councillor Anders Christensen</b></p>
<p><b>Supporting Member:</b> <i>(who will attend the meeting)</i></p>	
<p><b>Names of other Members supporting the call-in request:</b> <i>(a minimum of 21 is required)</i> <i>(written evidence of the support of additional members is required by providing a copy of an email from a Member confirming their support for this call-in. Alternatively, a Member can email confirming their support direct to the Democracy mailbox)</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cllr A Poland-Goodyer</li> <li>2. Cllr S Lambert</li> <li>3. Cllr S Morgan</li> <li>4. Cllr P Cooper</li> <li>5. Cllr T Hunter-Watts</li> <li>6. Cllr A Wheelhouse</li> <li>7. Cllr S Wilson</li> <li>8. Cllr M Knight</li> <li>9. Cllr G Wadhwa</li> <li>10. Cllr M Baldwin</li> <li>11. Cllr A Baughan</li> <li>12. Cllr P Griffin</li> <li>13. Cllr T Dixon</li> <li>14. Cllr R Khan</li> <li>15. Cllr N Rana</li> <li>16. Cllr S James</li> <li>17. Cllr I Hussain</li> <li>18. Cllr W Raja</li> <li>19. Cllr P Drayton</li> <li>20. Cllr K Bates</li> <li>21. Cllr M Fayyaz</li> </ol>

	22. Cllr N Hussain 23. Cllr T Hussain
Date:	10 June 2022

*Please refer to the call-in procedure detailed in Part G Para 2.60 onwards in the [constitution](#).*

*This form will be submitted to the democracy mailbox at [democracy@buckinghamshire.gov.uk](mailto:democracy@buckinghamshire.gov.uk)*

This page is intentionally left blank



## Call-in Request Notice

A call-in request has been submitted from Councillor Anders Christensen, supported by 23 Councillors. The call-in request will be considered at a forthcoming meeting of the Growth, Infrastructure & Housing Select Committee, details of which will be advertised when confirmed. The reasons for the call-in request are set out below.

### Title

Proposed residential development at the site of the former Buckinghamshire County Council Community Sports and Social Club Land

### Cabinet meeting

7 June 2022

### Reasons for the call-in request

The request for Call-In is attached. The Monitoring Officer considers that the first ground Call-In relating to the ACV is not valid but the second ground for Call-In is valid, namely the statement from Councillor Anders Christensen that:

*"9.1. States that the results of a 'pre-planning consultation will be considered' before a decision is made. The result of that consultation was not included in the papers before cabinet and have yet to be published to either members or the public. Until the results of the pre-planning consultation are published I do not believe the decision to proceed with the development of the site can be considered Safe."*

The call-in request is supported by the following Councillors:

1. Cllr A Poland-Goodyer
2. Cllr S Lambert
3. Cllr S Morgan
4. Cllr P Cooper
5. Cllr T Hunter-Watts
6. Cllr A Wheelhouse
7. Cllr S Wilson
8. Cllr M Knight
9. Cllr G Wadhwa
10. Cllr M Baldwin
11. Cllr A Baughan

12. Cllr P Griffin
13. Cllr T Dixon
14. Cllr R Khan
15. Cllr N Rana
16. Cllr S James
17. Cllr I Hussain
18. Cllr W Raja
19. Cllr P Drayton
20. Cllr K Bates
21. Cllr M Fayyaz
22. Cllr N Hussain
23. Cllr T Hussain

## **Background papers**

[7 June 2022 Cabinet meeting](#)

## **Contact Officer**

Sarah Ashmead Monitoring Officer

## Extract from Buckinghamshire Council Constitution – Call In

### Call-In Procedure

- 2.60. Call In procedure is a statutory right which can be applied to any decision which has been taken but not yet implemented (Section 21(3) LGA 2000). Call In is a procedure whereby councillors may question decisions taken by the Cabinet in exceptional circumstances and therefore may hold the Cabinet to account.
- 2.61. When a decision is a key decision made by the Cabinet or an individual Cabinet Member, or an executive decision made by an officer with delegated authority, or any committee under joint arrangements, the decision shall be published, including where possible by electronic means, and shall be available at the main offices of the Council normally within two working days of being made. The Chairman of the relevant Select Committee will be sent copies of the records of all such decisions within the same timescale, by the person responsible for publishing the decision unless the decision taker has certified that the decision is urgent and to be implemented immediately.
- 2.62. That notice will bear the date on which it is published and will specify that the decision will come into force, and may then be implemented, on the expiry of three working days after the publication of the decision, unless either the decision maker has certified that the matter is urgent and requires implementation urgently or a call-in request has been received by, at the latest, 5.00pm on the third working day after the decision has been made in accordance with Rule 2.67. If a call-in request is received the decision will not be implemented until the call-in process is complete, unless the decision is urgent.
- 2.63. A decision which has been taken and implemented may still be reviewed by the Select Committees, but such a review will not delay the implementation of the decision.
- 2.64. A decision may only be called in once and a decision may not be called in where the substance of the decision has already been subjected to scrutiny by a Select Committee unless there have been substantial changes to the decision or where the Section 151 Officer has certified that a delay in the implementation of a decision will result in significant additional cost to the Council.
- 2.65. The grounds for a Call-In Request are:
- a. The decision has not been made in accordance with this Constitution, Council policies or Council procedures and processes;
  - b. The decision is outside of the Council's policy framework or the budget approved by the Council;
  - c. The decision is outside of the powers of the Council;
  - d. The decision is unlawful.
- 2.66. Once a recommendation for a decision is published, any member of the relevant Select Committee may ask to see the papers to be considered (except insofar as they contain confidential or exempt information) and take preliminary advice from

officers supporting the Select Committee about the implications of the decision.

- 2.67. At least 15% (rounded up) of councillors representing the number of councillor seats on the Council must notify the Monitoring Officer within three working days of the publication of the decision of an intention to request the Select Committee to examine the decision and of any requirement for the attendance by a Cabinet Member or any Officer. Within two working days of the notification of the call in request the same number of councillors must confirm whether they wish to proceed with the Call In Request and if so, provide the required details via the form.
- 2.68. The Monitoring Officer will decide whether the Call In Request is valid in accordance with paragraph 2.69 below within two working days (timescale). Once validated a Call In Request will be treated as a Call In Notice.
- 2.69. The Monitoring Officer will determine the call in request to be invalid if:
- a. It relates to a matter which is to be determined by the Council or a Committee of the Council;
  - b. It relates to a decision of the Cabinet/Cabinet Member taken as a matter of urgency and the Chairman of the appropriate Select Committee or such other person as detailed in the urgency rules had been consulted or a Select Committee had previously agreed the need for urgency;
  - c. It relates to a matter where the associated report has already been considered by a Select Committee;
  - d. if it has not been made in accordance with this procedure;
  - e. is not completed correctly;
  - f. it does not identify the decision;
  - g. it does not detail a valid ground for call in;
  - h. it does not provide clear written reasons why one of the valid grounds for call in applies;
  - i. is not signed by the required number of councillors;
  - j. The call-in form is received after the specified deadline;
  - k. The reason for the call-in is unclear or does not relate directly to the decision specified on the call-in form;
  - l. The reason for the call-in is a question, the answer to which can be found in the report relating to the decision which is being called in.
- 2.70. A call-in may only be withdrawn by notification in writing or electronically submitted to the Monitoring Officer from all the councillors who requested the call-in.
- 2.71. Once the deadline for requesting calling in items and the determination of the validity of call-ins has passed, the Monitoring Officer will inform all councillors of the call-in and will arrange for it to be considered at the next meeting of the appropriate Select Committee. The agenda for that meeting will show the written

reasons given for the call-in, the councillors who signed the call-in, and enclose the relevant documents.

- 2.72. Select Committee shall discuss the Call In Notice at its next regular meeting or at a Special Meeting whichever is sooner provided that the required five clear days notice of the meeting can be given.
- 2.73. At least two of the councillors who called in a decision must be present and at least one of whom will present their reasons for call-in at the meeting of the Select Committee which considers the call-in. If two councillors do not attend, the call-in will fail.

### **Call-In Notice**

- 2.74. At the meeting where the Select Committee is considering the Call In Notice it should first take advice as to whether the request to call in the decision is valid, consider whether there is a case for the decision to be called in and whether any further information is required by hearing from one of the councillors who signed the call in request (and witnesses) and the decision maker who will explain the reasons for the decision. Once the Committee have considered the evidence provided during the meeting they will decide whether to uphold or reject the call-in Notice.
- 2.75. If, following discussion, the Select Committee agrees that the matter should be called in they may proceed either to examine the decision at that meeting or adjourn to investigate the decision at another meeting. Upon calling-in a decision, a Select Committee may recommended to the Cabinet, Cabinet Member or officer as appropriate:-
  - a. Whether the decision should be reconsidered and if so, they can also recommend an alternative decision, actions or options or what matters or issues should be considered;
  - b. That they are satisfied with the original decision;
  - c. Whether any future action should be taken in light of a decision so as to ensure the better implementation of that decision;
  - d. Whether any further action should be taken in light of that decision so as to improve the manner or quality of future decision making;
  - e. Refer to full Council.

### **Consideration of decision after Call-In Notice**

- 2.76. The Select Committee will have at its disposal the information which has been submitted to the Cabinet or Cabinet Member. They can require the relevant Cabinet Member(s) and appropriate officers to attend the meeting to answer questions about the issue. If the Select Committee accepts the original decision by the Cabinet or Cabinet Member it becomes immediately effective. If the Select Committee makes a recommendation to the Cabinet or Cabinet Member to amend a decision, this will be considered by the Cabinet at its next meeting or by the Cabinet Member as soon as reasonably practicable.

- 2.77. If the Cabinet or Cabinet Member disagree with the recommendation of the Select Committee to amend a decision they will inform the Select Committee. In such circumstances, the Select Committee may refer the matter to the next meeting of the Council for decision. In these circumstances the Council will have before them the views of both the Select Committee and the Cabinet or Cabinet Member. If the Cabinet or Cabinet Member decides further work needs to be done, they may defer the item for this to be carried out.
- 2.78. If the Committee agrees that further investigation or information is required, the Cabinet or Cabinet Member may agree to extend the time in which a final view may be expressed.
- 2.79. If, having considered the decision, the Select Committee is still concerned about it, then it may refer it back to the decision making person or body for reconsideration, setting out in writing the nature of its concerns, or refer the matter to full Council. If referred to the decision maker he or she shall then reconsider within a further five working days, amending the decision or not, before adopting a final decision.
- 2.80. If the decision taker requires more time to consider, the Select Committee's recommendations the time may be extended by the Chairman of the Select Committee after agreement by one other member of the Committee.
- 2.81. If the decision taker is, after reconsideration, not able to make changes to the decision in accordance with the Committees concerns the decision taker shall write to the Committee setting out reason why the decision taker is unable to accede to the Select Committee concerns.
- 2.82. If following an objection to the decision, the Select Committee does not meet in the period set out above, or does meet but does not refer the matter back to the decision making person or body, the decision shall take effect on the date of the Select Committee meeting, or the expiry of that further five working day period, whichever is the earlier.
- 2.83. If the matter was referred to full Council and the Council does not object to a decision which has been made, then no further action is necessary and the decision will be effective. However, if the Council does object, it has no power to make decisions in respect of a Cabinet decision unless it is contrary to the Policy Framework, or contrary to or not wholly consistent with the Budget. Unless that is the case, the Council will refer any decision to which it objects back to the decision making person or body, together with the Council's views on the decision. That decision making body or person shall choose whether to amend the decision or not before reaching a final decision and implementing it. Where the decision was taken by the Cabinet, a meeting will be convened to reconsider within five working days of the Council request. Where the decision was made by an individual, the individual will reconsider within five working days of the Council request.
- 2.84. If the Council does not meet, or if it does but does not refer the decision back to the decision making body or person, the decision will become effective on the date of the Council meeting or expiry of the period in which the Council meeting should have been held, whichever is the earlier.
- 2.85. The councillor who has put the matter on the agenda may address the Committee

on the matter.

### **Call-In – Urgent Decisions**

- 2.86. Decisions of the Cabinet or any Cabinet Member which are urgent (i.e. any delay likely to be caused by the call-in process would prejudice the Council's or the public's interest) will not be subject to call-in.
- 2.87. The records of such decisions will reflect the reasons for urgency and state that therefore they are not subject to call-in.
- 2.88. The Chairman of the appropriate Select Committee must agree the need for urgency unless the Select Committee has already given its approval to a decision being taken urgently so that call-in does not apply. In the absence of the Chairman the Chairman of Council or the Vice-Chairman will be invited to perform this role.
- 2.89. Any reports on which urgent decisions have been made are to be reported to Select Committee for it to understand the need for urgency, but this will not delay implementation of the urgent decision itself.

This page is intentionally left blank



## Report to Cabinet

<b>Date:</b>	7 <sup>th</sup> June 2022
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Request for Cabinet approval to submit an Outline Planning Application for a proposed residential development at the site of former Buckinghamshire County Council Community Sports and Social Club Land</b>
<b>Cabinet Member(s):</b>	John Chilver – Cabinet Member for Accessible Housing and Resources
<b>Contact officer:</b>	David Pearce, Capital Projects Performance Manager 01296 383984 <a href="mailto:david.pearce@buckinghamshire.gov.uk">david.pearce@buckinghamshire.gov.uk</a>
<b>Ward(s) affected:</b>	Aylesbury South East and Wendover, Halton and Stoke Mandeville.
<b>Purpose of this report:</b>	<b>Ask Cabinet for approval to Submit an Outline Planning application for the land at Stoke Mandeville.</b>

*There is a confidential part to this report, which is exempt by virtue of paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of Part 1 of Schedule 12a of the Local Government Act 1972 because it contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)*

## **Recommendations:**

- 1. Cabinet authorises the Director for Property and Assets in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance Resources and Property & Assets to instruct the submission of an Outline Planning Application consisting of up to 100 residential units including 30% affordable Housing, a new road link between Booker Park School and Lower Road, an increase in size of the existing access road to Lower Road and the provision of a sports and leisure area for community and school use.**
- 2. Cabinet notes that this site being Council owned land provides an opportunity to provide services to the benefit of Buckinghamshire residents, such as affordable and keyworker housing in excess of statutory requirements and homes for clients of adults and children's services that cannot be imposed on privately owned development sites.**
- 3. Should an outline planning application be successful, Cabinet authorises the Director for Property and Assets in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance Resources and Property & Assets and relevant service Directors and heads of service to develop a draft and bring forward a proposed detailed development scheme for further consideration by Cabinet**

## **Reason for decision:**

- The proposed Outline Planning Application will set out the proposed number of accommodation units, the proportion of affordable housing, the provision of a sports and leisure area for community and school use, an expanded access road and a new road link to Booker Park School. It is not proposed to consider the detail of accommodation. This will be dealt with as reserved matters.
- There is insufficient information available at this point to decide on the mix and proportion of different proposed uses. This will be the subject of a business case that will be drafted through consultation with relevant services and submitted for a future decision.
- Submitting an early outline planning application will enable the application to be considered ahead of or together with, the emerging Stoke Mandeville Local Area Neighbourhood Plan.

## **1. Executive summary**

- 1.1** An Outline Planning Application is intended to preserve the flexibility of future design and composition of the development and represents a good opportunity to

provide mainly affordable and key worker homes in an ideal location due to the proximity with Stoke Mandeville Hospital and this same specific location provides a rare prospect to include a provision for bespoke and adaptable housing for the special exigent needs of clients of both adult's and children's services.

1.2 Following a successful outline planning determination, there are several stages that will need to be completed before any development work can start. These works include but not exhaustively:

- a) Business cases for affordable housing additional to statutory requirements, keyworker housing, Step down accommodation, housing for both Adult's Services and Children's Services clients
- b) Fulfilment of any planning conditions
- c) Preparation of a detailed masterplan including phasing
- d) Approval of detailed design
- e) Fulfilment of Asset of Community value considerations.
- f) Finalisation of development appraisals and funding requirements

This detailed design work will be a process that stretches over several months

1.3 The former Bucks CC Sports and Social Club ('the site') is located off Lower Road in Stoke Mandeville. It is approximately 3.7 hectares in size. The Site currently comprises a closed club house surrounded by open land which was formerly used as sports pitches and tennis courts. The former Sports and Social Club Land has remained unused for some years and as currently stands represents a drain on the Council's resources in ensuring public safety while enforcing security.

1.4 The proposal is for the demolition of all existing structures and the Outline Planning Application sets the scene for the future development in seeking consent for the construction of up to approximately 100 residential units with a re-provision for open space for day-to-day use and includes the LPA's statutory requirement that 30% of that number be affordable accommodation. Consent is also sought for improving the main access road and extending the main estate road to provide Booker Park School with a second vehicular access point that would greatly relieve congestion adjacent to the existing school entrance.

1.5 The scheme was revised following pre-app advice and then again following consultation with Stoke Mandeville Parish Council and SMPC's retained architects. No doubt there will be further detailed refinements, but the hope would be that the quantum of development is now fairly settled.

- 1.6 The specific uses of the residential units are not referenced in this application as they will be dealt with as reserved matters once the mix of accommodation is agreed.
- 1.7 The Stoke Mandeville site is also identified as the preferred location for a new primary electricity substation which is part of Bucks Council's HIF investment programme and is targeted to bring in substantial HIF funding, which will hugely benefit the Council and Buckinghamshire residents and supports the future growth of Aylesbury by alleviating any existing grid capacity constraints. A separate planning application will be submitted by UKPN soon.

## **2. Content of report: This document including the following appendices:**

### **Appendices: -**

- 2.1 A1 Site plan
- 2.2 A2 Proposed master plan
- 2.3 CA1 Confidential Appendix

## **3. Other options considered**

- 3.1 Doing nothing would result in the site being potentially being designated as open space in the emerging neighbourhood plan which would greatly inhibit any opportunity for development and risk the forecasted capital receipt expected from this property. **This is not a recommended option.**
- 3.2 Submit a fully worked up detailed planning application for a scheme. Unless the Council intend to build out the scheme themselves, this approach will cost an additional £250k to £400K and is unlikely to deliver an application consistent with that which an external developer would find to be acceptable and could potentially reduce the site disposal value. **This is not a recommended option.**
- 3.3 Gift the site to the Local Community and re-open the former Sports and Social Club and to use as sports pitches. This approach would result in the loss of future potential revenue or capital receipts to the Council and was tried at the time when the facility was first closed with negotiations to allow the local community to provide a workable model to allow the facility to continue being persevered for two years without any realistic proposal coming forward. Since then, the property and site have fallen into substantial disrepair and would require significantly more financial investment to reinstate. **This is not a recommended option.**
- 3.4 Sell the site now as an unconditional offer or possibly an unconditional offer plus overage on receipt of planning. There are some good planning prospects to the site – surrounded by development, sustainable location etc – but equally, the site has no

planning status and could be considered an important local open space etc – so any unconditional buyer would be taking on a significant risk that planning permission for development may be less than initially assumed, and/or take longer than expected to secure or may not come at all if the land is allocated as a protected open space for example. We are advised by Consultants that a prudent buyer might pay in the region of say 25% of potential value (based on the open space exemplar, affordable housing policy compliant scheme) fully unconditionally – or say 15% plus an uplift clause where circa 50% of the uplift in value derived from a future planning permission is paid back to the Council. It is worth noting that the Council would have very little if any control over the planning process after a sale, so control is lost. Having regard to the rest of the report, **this is not a recommended option.**

- 3.5 Submit an Outline Planning Application at the earliest possible opportunity for approximately 100 residential units including 30% affordable Housing, a new road access between Booker Park School and Lower road, an increase in size of the existing access road and the provision of a sports area for Community and school use. **This is the recommended option.**

#### **4. Legal Implications**

- 4.1 As a result of delegation set out in the property and assets schemes of delegation for officers 2.10 giving authority to the Director for Property and Assets in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance, Resources and Property and Assets.
- 4.2 This site is registered as an asset of Community value (ACV) and as such if BC decides to dispose of the asset then it would first need to publicise the fact and allow an opportunity for local people to make a bid. The maximum moratorium period is 6 months from receipt of the notice of intention to dispose, from the landowner. Upon receipt of the notice this triggers an initial 6-week moratorium which is only extended to the full 6 months if the community group express an intention to bid. An 18 month period to sell runs from the landowners notice, effectively giving the landowner a minimum of 1 year to sell following the six month moratorium or, 16.5 months if only the six week moratorium applies. After the moratorium period the owner is free to sell to whomever they choose and at whatever price, and no further moratorium will apply for the remainder of a protected period lasting 18 months.
- 4.3 This report was sent for clearance to Legal & Democratic Services who confirm that subject to compliance with the Contracts Procedure Rules and subject to availability of funding and decision-making processes being followed, the Council has power under S111 of the Local Government Act 1972 and/or Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011 (Local authority's general power of competence) to undertake the development described in this report.

## 5. Financial implications for this report:

### **Costs incurred:**

*Quoted cost of OL planning application*

*and desk top valuation* £150,000

*Contingency sum @5%* £7,500

*Total Cost* £157,500

*The costs have so far been met from the Strategic Asset Reserve*

## 6. Corporate implications and risks

- 6.1 Property & Assets are aware of the emerging Stoke Mandeville local area plan and Attempts have been made to reach an accommodation with Stoke Mandeville Parish Council and Stoke Mandeville Local Plan Steering Group regarding the Development. These negotiations have proved successful and as a result amended proposal are to be included in the proposed Stoke Mandeville Local Area Plan. However, SMPC have added the caveat that if agreement is not reached, the plan will revert to a proposed designation of Green Open Space. The positive Interaction between SMPC and BC indicates that the risk, although still existing is greatly diminished. If realised this would seriously inhibit the chances of a future development and realisation of Capital Receipts.
- 6.2 Sports England will need to be consulted to reach an agreement that the sports provision to be re-provided is an acceptable replacement for that historically in place.
- 6.3 Adjacent Council owned premises may need some alteration to accommodate a wider access road and the effect on Children's Services Clients must has been determined to be dominions and will be mitigated.
- 6.4 Both Adults and Children's services have expressed an interest in acquiring units on this site. A business case is currently being drafted to show how the costs of providing adults and children's accommodation can be considered against savings that can be made elsewhere by Children's and Adults Services to offset the financial investment required.

## 7. Local councillors & community boards consultation & views

<b>Cllr Sue Chapple-</b>	<b>Local Member for Aylesbury South East</b>
<b>Cllr David Thompson-</b>	<b>Local Member for Aylesbury South East</b>
<b>Cllr Denise Summers-</b>	<b>Local Member for Aylesbury South East</b>
<b>Cllr John Chilver-</b>	<b>Cabinet Member for Finance, Resources, Property &amp; Assets</b>
<b>Cllr Angela Macpherson-</b>	<b>Cabinet Member Health and Wellbeing</b>

<b>Cllr Timothy Butcher-</b>	<b>Deputy Cabinet Member for Resources</b>
<b>Cllr Gareth Williams-</b>	<b>Cabinet Member Planning and Regeneration</b>
<b>Cllr Stephen Bowles-</b>	<b>Local Member for Wendover Halton and Stoke Mandeville</b>
<b>Cllr Richard Newcombe-</b>	<b>Local Member for Wendover Halton and Stoke Mandeville</b>
<b>Cllr Peter Strachan-</b>	<b>Local Member for Wendover Halton and Stoke Mandeville</b>

The above Councillors have been consulted in August / September 2021 and invited to express their views by way of email correspondence. All responses received to date have been supportive. A further email was sent in September 2021 regarding further communication. A refresher was sent in February and another in March 2022.

## **8. Communication, engagement & further consultation**

- 8.1 Pre-planning application consultation ran between the 4<sup>th</sup> April and the 9<sup>th</sup> of May and includes community groups, residents, Stoke Mandeville Parish Council, the Stoke Mandeville local neighbourhood area plan steering group and other stakeholders. The results of this consultation will be available prior to this report being submitted to Cabinet.
- 8.2 A meeting was held with BC Schools team and Booker Park School where the school indicated that they were broadly supportive of the proposed development.

## **9. Next steps and review**

- 9.1 The results of the pre-planning consultation process will be considered ahead of a final decision being made
- 9.2 The Director for Property and assets instruct Consultants to submit an outline planning application for the Land at Stoke Mandeville.
- 9.3 Subject to Cabinet approval of this report and to the conclusion of 11.1, a further report on the options for development appraisals for the site which will consider the various development options highlighted in this report. . Options will consider an adult size all-weather sports pitch for use by the adjacent school and by the local community, open Market Houses, Affordable Homes, Keyworker Homes and apartments for adults and Children's services.

## **10. Background papers**

- 10.1 Report by Savills titled 'Land at Stoke Mandeville – former sports and social club' dated 1<sup>st</sup> Feb 2022.

## **11. Your questions and views (for key decisions)**

- 11.1 If you have any questions about the matters contained in this report, please get in touch with the author of this report. If you have any views that you would like the cabinet member to consider, please inform the democratic services team. This can be done by **telephone 01296764814** or: **email [democracy@buckinghamshire.gov.uk](mailto:democracy@buckinghamshire.gov.uk)**



1. Lower Road

2. Entrance to site

3. Car Park, currently used  
for Hospital staff parking

4. Former Clubhouse

This page is intentionally left blank



Development to be predominantly two storey houses with some opportunities for three storey houses and apartment buildings

Improved Junction to Lower Road

Potential for Sports provision

- Key**
- - - Site boundary
  - New homes (mix of houses and apartments)
  - Public green space
  - Private green space
  - Parking zone
  - Access road
  - Potential path
  - Existing trees
  - Proposed trees



This page is intentionally left blank

---

# Consultation Summary

---

Former Buckinghamshire County Council Sports  
and Social Club Land, Lower Road, Stoke  
Mandeville

DRAFT

DRAFT

## 1.0 Consultation Activity

### Engaging with Key Stakeholders

#### Local Councillors

- 1.1. Prior to engaging local residents, local council members and other stakeholders were contacted via email to be invited to an hour session ahead of the public exhibition events on 25th April and 27th April. A number of Councillors attended these sessions, were introduced to the proposals and were offered a briefing on the scheme.

#### Stoke Mandeville Parish Council (SMPC) & Stoke Mandeville Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (SMNPSG)

- 1.2. Meetings with SMPC and SMNPSG were held in December 2021 and February 2022. Following the February 2022 meeting, it was decided that Buckinghamshire Council (BC) would work with SMPC on the design of the proposal. Accordingly design work collaboratively began with Untitled Practice, the architectural advisors for the project to SMNPSG.
- 1.3. Broadly the design developed from a loose residential estate style (by Savills) into a more formal garden square style development (following the influence of Untitled Practice). This was the plan displayed at the Public Exhibition events. BC representatives were present at the events to explain the proposals and plan with members of SMPC also often in attendance.

#### Sports England

- 1.4. A pre-application request to discuss the proposals with Sport England was submitted on 18th February 2022. Sport England has since reviewed the proposals and provided an initial response by email on 7th March 2022. A meeting was suggested and will be held on 26th May 2022.

# Consultation Summary

Former Buckinghamshire County Council Sports and Social Club Land, Lower Road, Stoke Mandeville



## Buckinghamshire Council

- 1.5. A pre-application request was submitted to Buckinghamshire Council LPA on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2022, and a meeting is arranged for 27<sup>th</sup> May 2022 to discuss the proposals.

## **Consultation with the local Community**

- 1.6. Consultation with the local community comprised of an online consultation, and two in-person public drop in events. The local community were informed about both types of engagement through a letter-drop to residents in the boundary highlighted in the plan below. Advertising details of the consultation was carried out and information was posted on notice boards in local businesses and community centres. The distribution area can be seen in Figure 1.



*Figure 1 – Invitation letter drop distribution area*

# Consultation Summary

Former Buckinghamshire County Council Sports and Social Club Land, Lower Road, Stoke Mandeville



## Consultation Webpage

1.7. A dedicated webpage was hosted by Your Voice Bucks and found at:

<https://yourvoicebucks.citizenspace.com/planning/stoke-mandeville-consultation/>.

1.8. The website ran live from 4th April 2022 until 9th May 2022 and included access to the plans and details of the proposals at a time that was suitable and convenient for them. An online questionnaire was also included where the local community could provide their thoughts.

1.9. Overall, 340 online feedback forms were received with the key themes detailed in Table 1 below.

## Phone calls and Emails

1.10. The website also provided an email address and phone number for the local community to provide feedback. In total, 25 responses via this method of feedback were received. The key themes of these responses are detailed in Table 1 below.

## Public Exhibition Events

1.11. Two public exhibition events were held at Eskdale Community Hall on 25th April 2022 from 10:00-16:00 and 27th April 2022 from 15:00-20:00. A variety of times were chosen to ensure members of the public with other commitments were not excluded from attending the events.

1.12. The first hour of each exhibition was for the Local Councillors to attend, review the proposals and ask any questions to the applicant team.

1.13. Registration forms were provided at both events. Whilst attendees were encouraged to complete registration forms, it was not compulsory and some declined. On 25th April, 36 attendees registered and on 27th April 27 attendees registered. The applicant's representatives at the events physically counted 71 attendees on the 25th April and 40 on the 27th April.

## Consultation Summary

Former Buckinghamshire County Council Sports and Social Club Land, Lower Road, Stoke Mandeville

---



- 1.14. Feedback forms were available to fill out during these events, and we received 8 in total. The key themes of these forms are outlined in Table 1 below.

DRAFT

# Consultation Summary

Former Buckinghamshire County Council Sports and Social Club Land, Lower Road, Stoke Mandeville



## 2.0 Feedback

### 2.1 Summary of Feedback Received

Response Type	Key Themes							
	Loss of Green Open Space	Objection to building houses on the site / in the area	Lack of infrastructure e.g. roads, schools, GP's	Traffic Concerns	Loss of Sports Facility	Loss of Community Facility	Re-build the Sports and Social Club	Disruption / Loss of wildlife
Online	164	149	148	108	88	87	40	27
Phone/ Email	9	17	14	6	4	1	4	1
Written	5	3	3	5	5	1	2	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>30</b>

*Table 1 – Summary of key themes from consultation responses received.*

2.2 It is key to note that the 'total' figures in Table 1 represent the number of respondents who raised each of the key themes. It was common within the results for each respondent to raise more than one theme within the 373 responses received.

2.3 We have chosen three representative comments for each key theme to provide an example of what was said within the feedback.

### Loss of Green Open Space

- *"Large areas of greenspace are essential for the health and wellbeing of the local communities... To keep this greenspace will be for the benefit of not just the existing residents but future ones too."*
- *"We need more accessible open spaces for the public to enjoy. Regenerate the tennis court!"*
- *"We moved to this area due to the wide open space for our children to play. It is very disappointing that the fields at Bucks CC have been shut up for the last few years. There is very little open space for children to play. New estates have been built off lower road with no park facilities and very little green space."*

### Objection to Building Houses on the Site / in the Area

- *"I question the 'need' and 'demand' for more houses. It was recently announced that Buckinghamshire has the lowest number of homeless people in the country. Each of those is of course a tragedy and needs help but I think the 'demand' comes from the construction industry leaders, who seem to have convinced our Government that only they can fix our broken economy and provide jobs. How about those workers being diverted to the massive task of converting our existing homes to be fossil fuel free?"*

# Consultation Summary

Former Buckinghamshire County Council Sports and Social Club Land, Lower Road, Stoke Mandeville



- *“There are too many houses being built without the necessary infrastructure.”*
- *“I do not feel like more housing is needed in that location as recently two developments have been going right by this site.”*

## Lack of Infrastructure e.g. roads, schools, GPs

- *“The roads need to be improved before any more development in Aylesbury. I commute into Aylesbury and it is completely gridlocked it is appalling!”*
- *“The plans state near Mandeville school – I doubt very much they would have capacity to take any more students for a completely new states. Doctors in Aylesbury are stretched. The hospital itself is barely coping at the moment. As usual roads & infrastructure don’t appear to feature in what is probably already a done deal.”*
- *“The primary issue is the lack of infrastructure to accompany these new homes. It is all but impossible to find an NHS dentist in Bucks, as waiting lists are at least 2 years long – at least one dentist has closed their waiting list. We do not have enough school places to accommodate existing children in their local schools let alone hundreds more.”*

## Traffic Concerns

- *“The total grid lock already experienced morning and evening around this whole area has become ridiculous, and now another 100 houses! Based on 2 cars per house that equates to an extra 400 vehicle movements minimum per day, without delivery vehicles etc. Already ambulances struggle to get through at peak times, as do other vehicles attempting to get to and from the hospital.”*
- *“Traffic and parking since recent developments over the past years have increased massively what with housing developments, Asda, HS2, etc.”*
- *“100 more houses will equal another 200+ cars on an already gridlocked road. No additional roads are being built around here to cope with the extra traffic.”*

## Loss of Sports Facility

- *“With the lack of sporting areas in the area where are people allowed to now go for outdoor activities which has been seen during the Pandemic there needs to be a larger range of accessible public open spaces.”*
- *“There is almost nowhere left for people to relax or for children to play in this area, and Eskdale Park is simply too far away in most respects. Children used to play ad-hoc cricket, football and other sports on this area, people jogged around the perimeter every day... It was an utterly invaluable much used and loved local resource.”*
- *“I believe the space should be used as community green space and reopen the Bucks club with proper management and updated facilities like "Aston Clinton" park has. Bring back the sport e.g. football, cricket, pool, darts, family fun days, family discos. Some of my best time as a child was going to the Bucks Club and seeing friend/family/local residents and attending fun days and family discos. There is nothing like this unless you want to travel to Aston Clinton. Also on the plans all you have said is "POTENTIAL" sports facilities!!!!”*

## Loss of Community Facility

- *“But we are lacking the community facility and ground for sports in Aylesbury and Stoke Mandeville. This site should be restored to its former glory for all to use.”*
- *“Shocking that this wonderful protected community asset, that Buckinghamshire Council own, is being considered for housing. Yes we need affordable housing which this location could be used for, 100% of the land. But we are lacking the community facility and ground for sports in Aylesbury and Stoke Mandeville. This site should be restored to its former glory for all to use.”*
- *“This is a real kick in the teeth, a perfectly good safe community facility that has been closed off to the people you serve all for profit. Where are our children supposed to play and exercise safely?”*

# Consultation Summary

Former Buckinghamshire County Council Sports and Social Club Land, Lower Road, Stoke Mandeville



## Re-build the Sports and Social Club

- *“Rather than redeveloping the site for residential housing, I think the site should be reinstated as a sports and social club and the existing facilities improved.”*
- *“In addition to the housing etc and the sports facilities, I feel that the former Sports and Social club should be rebuilt to house an area for a cafe/bar for the use if the residence of the new houses also the estates adjacent, to be used by young families, working people, elderly and people who like to walk their dogs and sit and have a drink etc with their friends.”*
- *“If you want to develop this area invest in the social club and sports aspect.”*

## Disruption / Loss of Wildlife

- *“My views are what will happen to the hedgerows and wildlife which there are plenty on those grounds.”*
- *“Development will necessitate the need to remove the ancient hedgerow currently behind properties on Lennon Way. It was previously a planning requirement to maintain the ancient hedgerow for wildlife and to preserve the history of the area. Losing this hedgerow will greatly impact the natural wildlife.”*
- *“The beautiful green space we have will be taken and the wildlife will be further displaced.”*

# Consultation Summary

Former Buckinghamshire County Council Sports and Social Club Land, Lower Road, Stoke Mandeville



2.4 The key themes collated from all the responses are outlined in Table 1 above. It is evident from the feedback that the loss of green open space raised a lot of concern from the local community, with 174 responses including comments regarding this. Other key themes which were discussed frequently included objection to building houses on the site or within the local area due to the amount of recent residential development in Stoke Mandeville. The majority of these responses linked this to the impact on the local infrastructure, with many suggesting that until more infrastructure is provided in the area, such as GP surgeries and schools, no more houses should be built. Traffic concerns were also mentioned within many responses, with comments about the high traffic levels on Lower Road at present and how it was considered that if more houses were added, the traffic would become a lot worse.

2.5 However, not all responses were responding negatively to the proposals. Out of the 377 responses received, 30 of these were in support of the proposals and these responses acknowledged the need for housing, particularly affordable housing within the Borough. In addition, 14 responses received were neutral where they stated that they weren't opposed to the proposals however they weren't for them either. The total breakdown of the 368 responses is outlined in Table 2 below.

	Support	Neutral	Objection	TOTAL
<b>No. of responses</b>	30	14	329	373
<b>% of responses</b>	8%	4%	88%	100%

**Table 2** – Breakdown of responses.

