

## Steeple Claydon Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Survey

### Summary of outcomes

#### Introduction

Steeple Claydon Parish Council is in the process of developing a Neighbourhood Plan for the village. A Neighbourhood Plan will allow the village to influence the planning and development of housing and also identify other important areas relating to employment, leisure and amenities. The Neighbourhood Plan survey is part of the evidence base used in order to understand how local people feel in relation to the key issues. It was part of a wider consultation programme which includes public meetings and exhibitions.

This report will provide a summary of the outcomes of the Steeple Claydon Neighbourhood Plan Survey and provide a list of recommendations that can be utilised when developing the Neighbourhood Plan in the future. The responses to each question within the survey will be presented and where relevant written comments will be summarised.

#### Format of the survey

The survey was developed by the Steeple Claydon Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee on behalf of the Parish Council

#### Number of responses

A total of 384 completed surveys were recorded. 51 of these were completed online and the remaining 333 were returned using the pre-paid envelope. 969 surveys were distributed in the village and this therefore means that the response rate was 40%.

#### Age group of respondents

Each respondent was asked to circle all of the age groups that lived in their property. The question was not compulsory. 326 people answered this question. The results were as follows:

- Under 16 –21%
- 17-24 – 10%
- 25-40 – 26%
- 41-64 – 54%
- 65+ - 43%

The percentages add up to more than 100% because there were often members of the household who fell within different age groups.

### Question 1 - Types of new development

Question 1 asked respondents to indicate the level of priority they would give to different types of new homes in Steeple Claydon. Seven different options were provided and there was also space to make suggestions for other types of home. The results are shown below:

Type of home	Low priority (%)	High priority (%)
Smaller housing (1-2 bedroom)	35	65
Small family homes (3 bedrooms)	20	80
Large family homes (4+ bedrooms)	76	24
Bungalows	51	49
Sheltered/retirement homes	44	56
Homes for older downsizers	44	56
Self build	85	15

In order to ascertain which types of home would be preferred it is possible to look at the total number of people who gave a high priority to each type of home. Those with the most number of respondents giving it a high priority would be the most preferable. The priority order from high to low is shown below:

1. Small family homes (3 bedrooms)
2. Smaller housing (1-2 bedrooms)
3. Homes for downsizers
4. Sheltered/retirement homes
5. Bungalows
6. Large family homes (4+ bedrooms)
7. Self build

When studying the break down on the results it is very clear that small family homes and smaller housing are the most popular and large family homes and self build the least popular. In relation to the top two answers there was a large number of people placing a high priority on these options and few placing a low priority. Vice versa is applicable for the bottom two answers. Those types of homes in positions 3-5 are less clear cut and this is shown in the percentages table above.

Other types of home that were suggested were:

- None of these
- 2 storey flats

- Starter homes
- Homes with land/equestrian facilities
- Shared ownership
- Housing association
- Pre-fab houses
- Lifetime homes

In terms of the other the other types of home being suggested, a number of surveys were returned stating that they did not want any types of new home in the village. It is therefore important that the reasons why housing in some form is inevitable in Steeple Claydon are explained to local residents clearly. Some of the other suggestions are dealt with in question 2 of the survey (shared ownership and housing association). The other suggestions could be considered when developing the Plan.

*Neighbourhood Plan recommendation - Preference for smaller housing and family homes of between 1 and 3 bedrooms. Large family housing and self build are least preferred.*

#### **Question 2 – Types of housing scheme**

Question 2 asked respondents to indicate the level of priority they would give to different types of housing scheme in Steeple Claydon. Four different options were provided. The results are shown below:

<b>Type of housing scheme</b>	<b>Low priority (%)</b>	<b>High priority (%)</b>
Affordable homes	22	78
Community housing (parish owned)	47	53
Rental properties	70	30
Shared ownership schemes.	43	57

In order to ascertain which types of housing scheme would be preferred it is possible to look at the total number of people who gave a high priority to each type of housing. Those with the most number of respondents giving it a high priority would be the most preferable. The priority order from high to low is shown below:

1. Affordable homes
2. Shared ownership
3. Community housing (parish owned)
4. Rental properties

When studying the break down on the results it is very clear that the most popular type of housing is affordable housing and the least is rental properties. A large number of people gave a high priority to affordable housing and a large number of people gave a low priority to rental properties. In relation to the other two options the result was more balanced and this is shown within the percentages table above.

*Neighbourhood Plan recommendation - Preference for affordable housing. Rental least preferred. Split opinion on shared ownership and community housing schemes.*

### Question 3 – Size of developments

Question 3 asked respondents to indicate the size of future housing developments that would be preferred in Steeple Claydon. Four different options were provided and respondents could tick as many as they felt applicable. Respondents could also add their own comments. The results are shown below:

Size of housing development	Percentage
6-12 houses	48%
12-30 houses	52%
30-60 houses	25%
60+	8%

The percentages add up to more than 100% because respondents could tick more than one box. The preference in terms of housing size from high to low is shown below:

1. 12-30 houses
2. 6-12 houses
3. 30-60 houses
4. 60+ houses

A development size of between 12 and 30 houses was the most preferred with 6-12 houses also popular. A quarter of the respondents to the question felt that developments of 30-60 dwellings would be appropriate with few preferring developments of over 60. There is therefore a preference of developments of between 6 and 30 houses followed by between 30 and 60 houses.

53 people commented on the question. A summary of the comments is shown below:

- We don't need/want any more housing in Steeple Claydon. There are already traffic problems and pressure on existing facilities in the village.
- We don't want to lose the feel of being a village
- Larger number of small developments preferable
- Any development needs associated infrastructure
- No demand in the village
- No large estates

The comments section shows that there are general concerns from some residents regarding any new housing in Steeple Claydon in terms of its physical impact on roads, services and facilities as well as the impact on the 'feel' of the village. Approximately 35% of the 53 people who commented on the question did not want any extra development in the village. It is important that the reasons why housing in some form is necessary in Steeple Claydon are explained to local residents clearly. The majority of the remainder of the comments referred to the fact that a larger number of smaller developments would be preferable in order to retain character and the village 'feel'. There is also a common view that investment would need to be made in the relevant infrastructure and services/facilities if additional is required.

*Neighbourhood Plan recommendation - Preference for sites between 12-30 units and a larger number of smaller schemes rather than 60+ sites.*

#### **Question 4 – most suitable sites for development**

At this stage in the survey a map of Steeple Claydon was provided showing six potential sites for development. Question 4 then asked residents to indicate which sites they regarded suitable for residential development in order of priority. Respondents were able to identify three preferred sites and there was also a comment box provided in order to indicate why they made their choices. The six sites were:

- A (North End Road)
- B, C, D (Buckingham Road)
- E, F (Molly's Field/Place)

For question 4 a calculation has been made in relation to how many times each site has appeared in a respondent's preferred top three. The results are shown below. The higher the percentage, the more times it was listed in a respondent's top 3.

Site E - 19.1%  
Site F - 18.9%  
Site C - 17.2%  
Site A - 15.8%

Site D - 14.6%

Site B - 14.4%

On this basis, site E was the most commonly included site within the preferred top three closely followed by site F. Sites D and B were included in a respondent's preferred top three the least times.

In terms of the comments relating to this question there was a wide variety of views depending on which sites respondents preferred. In general it was felt that sites E and F would result in less impact and less traffic through the village and that sites B, C and D represented a more attractive landscape. In relation to site A opinion was more split as some felt that it would be sensible to place houses next to a development that has already been approved but others felt that new development in this location would exacerbate existing concerns.

*Neighbourhood Plan recommendation - Preference for sites E and F. Take steps to mitigate impact of any developments on infrastructure, services and landscape.*

#### **Question 5 – least suitable sites for development**

Question 5 also utilised the map and asked residents to indicate which three sites they regarded least suitable for residential development. There was also a comment box provided in order to indicate why they made their choices.

For question 5 a calculation has been made in relation to how many times each site has appeared the respondents' least preferred three. The results are shown below. The higher the percentage, the more times it was listed in a respondents' bottom three choices for development.

Site D - 21.1%

Site B - 18.8%

Site C - 16.8%

Site A - 15.9%

Site E - 14.0%

Site F - 13.4%

On this basis site D is the least popular with B in second place. The results back up the responses to question 4 that sites E and F are preferred.

In terms of the comments made in relation to this question often the same issues were raised as with question 4. Comments relate to impact of development on the landscape of the sites, on traffic/highway safety and the impact on views.

It should be noted that as with previous questions there were a number of respondents who indicated that they did not want any new development in the village. This has been covered previously in this report.

*Neighbourhood Plan recommendation – Least preferred sites are D and B. Take steps to mitigate impact of any developments on infrastructure, services and landscape.*

### **Question 6 – suitable sites for industrial, commercial or retail development**

In relation to question 6 the sites on the map were referred to and respondents were asked if they felt if any of the sites had the potential for being developed for an industrial, commercial or retail use. Space was provided for suggestions for two suitable sites as well as comments.

In relation to question 6 the preferred sites for industrial, commercial or retail were:

Site F - 46.7%  
Site E - 18.1%  
Site C - 15.2%  
Site B - 11.4%  
Site D - 4.8%  
Site A - 3.8%

In relation to the comments many of the responses stated that they did not want to see any industrial development within the village. Many wished any such development to be situated on the outskirts of the village. The presence of HS2 was also referenced as a reason for choosing site F.

*Neighbourhood Plan recommendation – Majority prefer site F for industrial, commercial or retail development.*

### **Question 7 - Employment**

Question 7 of the survey asks whether the village needs more business premises to provide employment. Respondents were able to choose 'yes' or 'no'. The results were:

- Yes – 52%
- No – 48%

The results of question show that there is a split of opinion within the village as to whether more business premises are required. Although the majority of people who responded think that more business premises are required in the village, there is also a significant portion who do not.

*Neighbourhood Plan recommendation – Majority believe that more business premises are required but be aware that many villagers do not.*

### **Question 8 – Types of business premises**

Question 8 also related to employment and asks what type of business premises would respondents like to see within the village. Four options were given and it was possible to answer ‘yes’ or ‘no’ to each option. The results are shown in the table below:

<b>Type of business premises</b>	<b>Yes %</b>	<b>No %</b>
Offices	44	56
Small workshops	64	36
Light industrial	31	69
Storage	12	88

In order to ascertain which types of business premises would be preferred it is possible to look at the total number of people answered ‘yes’ to each type of business. Those with the most number of respondents being supportive of that type of business premises would be the most preferable. The priority order from high to low is shown below:

1. Small workshops
2. Offices
3. Light industrial
4. Storage

When studying the break down on the results it is very clear that storage is the least popular option. Small workshops were the most popular followed by offices. However, it should be noted that more respondents stated ‘no’ to offices than stated ‘yes’. Therefore care needs to be taken when utilising these results.

*Neighbourhood Plan recommendation - Preference for small workshops. Careful consideration required for other proposed business premises.*

### **Question 9 – Environment and sustainability**

Question 9 refers to green spaces shown on the map and asks respondents to give low or high priority for different environmental and sustainable features. Seven different options are provided. The results are shown below:

<b>Environmental/sustainable features</b>	<b>Low priority (%)</b>	<b>High priority (%)</b>
Protecting existing green spaces	3	97

Increasing green spaces around the village	25	75
Improving footpaths in and around the village	19	81
Improving cycle paths in and around the village	59	41
Improving bus services to and from the village	20	80
Introducing traffic calming features	42	58
Introducing flood protection measures	52	48

In order to ascertain which types of environmental or sustainable measure would be preferred it is possible to look at the total number of people who gave a high priority to each type measure. Those with the most number of respondents giving it a high priority would be the most preferable. The priority order from high to low is shown below:

1. Protecting existing open green spaces
2. Improving footpaths
3. Improving bus services
4. Increasing green spaces
5. Introducing traffic calming
6. Introducing flood protection measures
7. Introducing cycle paths

When studying the break down on the results it is very clear that measures placed 1 to 4 are the most popular and supported by the majority of people. In particular protecting existing green spaces is seen as very important. In relation to the features ranked 5 to 8 opinion on these is more divided.

*Neighbourhood Plan recommendation – Strong preference for protecting existing open green spaces. Support for improving footpaths, bus services and increasing green spaces. Opinion on traffic calming, flood protection measures and introducing cycle paths divided.*

#### Question 10 – Community assets

Question 10 relates to community assets and in particular to the GP surgery and the Co-Op. The question aimed to explore residents' views on whether the GP surgery and the Co-Op should remain where they are or whether they should be moved to a new purpose built site.

Respondents were asked to the following options from 1 to 3 with 1 being their preferred option. The options were:

- Leave both where they are
- Move the Co-Op to a purpose built site
- Move the surgery to a purpose built site

The results were:

- Leave both where they are - ranked 1 by 43%, ranked 2 by 10% ranked 3 by 47%
- Move the Co-op - ranked 1 by 52%, ranked 2 by 28%, ranked 3 by 20%
- Move the GP - ranked 1 by 52%, ranked 2 by 30%, ranked 3 by 18%

In relation to leave both the GP and surgery where they are most people who answered this question ranked it as their least preferred option. In relation to moving both the GP surgery and the Co-Op in both cases the majority of people ranked this as their number 1 option.

It is therefore preferred by the majority to relocate the Co-op and the GP.

*Neighbourhood Plan recommendation – Preference to move the GP surgery and Co-Op to a new location.*

#### **Question 11 – Recreation ground facilities**

Question 11 relates to facilities that are located within the recreation ground in the village. Respondents were asked which facilities within the recreation ground would be most valuable. They were asked to rank the facilities from 1 to 7 with 1 being their most preferred option. There was also space to suggest other facilities.

The ranks allocated to each facility were averaged and the results are shown below in priority order from high to low. The averaged ranks are shown in brackets.

1. Children's playground (1.97)
2. Football pitch (2.54)
3. Pavilion (3.21)
4. MUGA (3.23)
5. Cricket pitch (3.70)
6. Skateboard ramps (4.38)
7. Tennis court (4.66)

The averaged ranks show that the children's playground and football pitch were given the highest priority by respondents. The pavilion and MUGA in third and

fourth place respectively had close average ranks. The cricket pitch, skateboard ramp and tennis court were given the lowest ranks on average. Other suggestions that were made for facilities were:

- Indoor netball court
- Badminton courts
- Basketball hoop
- Picnic seating area
- Car parking
- Swimming pool
- Dog walking facilities
- More benches/trees
- Cycle track
- Bowls pitch
- Running/walking track
- No dogs
- Number of comments asking that the facilities remain as they are but are upgraded.

*Neighbourhood Plan recommendation – Preference for children’s playground and football pitch followed by pavilion and MUGA. Consider other suggestions and the possibility of upgrading existing facilities.*

**Question 12 – public venues for hire**

Question 12 relates to the public venues that are available for hire within the village. Respondents were asked whether each of the public venues currently available for hire meet the village needs. They were also asked whether another facility should be considered. The table below shows the results.

Does the venue meet the village needs?	Yes %	No %
Village hall	84	16
Mark Bulman Room	88	12
School hall	84	16

The responses show that the majority of people feel that the current venues meet the needs of the village. A summary of the additional comments are shown below:

- The venues meet village needs
- Haven’t used them so can’t comment

- Improved pavilion
- Community hall
- New village hall
- Social club
- Gym/sports facilities
- Youth club
- Scout hut

The results show that most people feel that the current public venues are suitable. However, the potential upgrade of these existing facilities and the pavilion as well as the other types of venues suggested should also be considered when developing the Plan.

*Neighbourhood Plan recommendation – Existing facilities meet the village needs. However also consider creation of additional venues and upgrade of existing facilities.*

### **Question 13 – Village facilities**

Question 13 asks respondents what other facilities they would like to see in the village. The list below shows the most popular responses.

- Pub serving good food/restaurant
- Café/tea room
- ATM
- Gym/swimming pool
- Improved bus services/train station
- Petrol station
- Protecting the Post Office

The highest demand is for a pub serving good food or a restaurant as well as a café or tea room. However, the other facilities on the list above were also popular. Approximately 30 responses indicated that they did not want any more facilities in the village. The following list contains other suggestions that were made by smaller numbers of people:

- Bigger supermarket
- Library
- Hairdressers
- Bank open at weekends

- NHS dentist
- Craft shop
- Better lighting
- Compost bins
- Small garden centre
- Children's indoor play
- Working mens club
- Dry cleaners
- Charity shop
- Chemist
- Solicitor
- Bus shelters
- Deli
- Youth club
- Private prep school
- Police outpost
- Butchers
- Veg shop
- Chinese/Indian takeaway
- Science and innovation park
- Bakery
- Speed camera
- Exhibition space
- Betting shop
- Self storage warehouse
- Electric car charger point
- DIY shop
- Improved bus service
- Light industrial workshops
- Vets

*Neighbourhood Plan recommendation – Highest demand for a pub serving good food, a restaurant and a café or tea room. Also popular are an ATM, gym/swimming pool, improved bus services/train station and a petrol station. Protecting the Post Office is also important. Consideration should also be given to the other suggestions made by respondents.*

### Question 14 – Facilities at the school

Question 14 relates to Steeple Claydon School and developing shared facilities with the community that would be available for community use outside of school hours. Three suggestions were made and respondents were asked what level of priority they would give each one. The results are in the table below.

Possible shared school facilities	Low priority (%)	High priority (%)
All weather Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) – netball/tennis/games court	23	77
Indoor swimming pool	42	58
Eco huts (bird watching/camping)	73	27

In order to ascertain which types of facility would be preferred it is possible to look at the total number of people who gave a high priority to each facility. Those with the most number of respondents giving it a high priority would be the most preferable. The priority order from high to low is shown below:

1. MUGA
2. Swimming pool
3. Ecohuts

When studying the break down on the results it is clear that the MUGA is the most popular option supported by the most people. The indoor swimming pool is also popular but there is also a proportion of people who would place a low priority on this facility. Eco huts are the least popular option with many people considering this as a low priority.

*Neighbourhood Plan recommendation – Preference for MUGA. Also support for indoor swimming pool. Least support for ecohuts.*

### Any other comments

At the end of the survey there is an opportunity for respondents to make any other comments. In some cases the additional comments made suggestions for village facilities that have been covered in question 13. Other comments in this section have also been recorded elsewhere in this report and these will not be repeated here. A summary of the other comments received are shown below

- We do not want any additional development in the village because we would like our village to remain as a village/we are already concerned about the threat of HS2/there is already considerable strain on local roads, facilities and services/the impact on the countryside will be too severe
- Thank you for requesting input from local people
- Questionnaire is well designed/thorough
- Development in the village is welcomed
- School and doctors will need extending/improving.
- We also need to consider the library
- Pedestrian crossing needed near Co-Op
- New development should be exemplar in terms of design and sustainability
- Want to ensure developers contributions directly benefit the village
- The village needs road improvements/one way system/parking
- Need support for the younger generation
- Questionnaire is a waste of time/money/badly designed
- Thought needs to be given to infrastructure such as electricity, gas, sewerage, broadband.
- Moving the GP/Co-Op to edge of the village will reduce accessibility especially for vulnerable groups.
- There are potential development sites other than those suggested in the survey

*Neighbourhood Plan recommendation – Consider suggestions within this section and take note of concerns raised or opportunities identified.*

### Limitations of survey outcomes

When recording and analysing the responses the following issues occurred. The table below indicates what the issue was and how this was resolved.

Issue	How this was resolved/dealt with
Respondents writing free hand comments on the survey.	If there was no comments box available relating specifically to the question then

	the freehand comments were recorded in the 'Any other comments' section at the end of the survey.
Respondents who want no development in the village not having anywhere to record this directly	As the emerging VALP will require some development within Steeple Claydon there was no option for those who oppose any new housing. However, when this was the view of a respondent it was recorded in the relevant comments section or in the final 'Any other comments' box.
In relation to questions 4, 5 and 6 respondents sometimes identified multiple options for each of their preferred sites rather than a single option for each.	When analysing the data the total number of times each site was included in a respondents preferred (Q4), least preferred (Q5) or as a suitable site (Q6) was recorded. This then allows an overall picture of the responses to be created.
In relation to question 10 (GP/Co-Op) sometimes respondents did not rank from 1 to 3. Instead they only recorded a single number depending on what their views were.	When analysing the data the total number of times an option is ranked 1, 2 or 3 was recorded. This then allows an overall picture of the responses to be created.
In relation to question 11 there were instances where respondents did not understand the ranking system and placed either a value from 1-10 or a percentage for each facility.	Where a number was provided in relation to a facility this was recorded as this would still indicate the preferences of the respondent. It was harder to record when a percentage was provided but the number of responses where this occurred was minimal.

### Summary of recommendations for the Neighbourhood Plan

This section of the report will provide a summary of the recommendations that were made in relation to each question. It should be noted that these are recommendations only which need to be considered by the Steeple Claydon Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee. When developing the Neighbourhood Plan the Steering Committee should take the results of the survey as one element of the outcomes of the wider consultation exercise. Where a recommendations has been influenced the Plan it will be necessary to explain how. If a recommendation has not influenced the Plan it will be necessary to explain why. The recommendations are shown below:

### **Part 1 Housing**

1. Types of new home - preference for smaller housing and family homes of between 1 and 3 bedrooms. Large family housing and self build are least preferred.
2. Types of housing scheme - preference for affordable housing. Rental least preferred. Split opinion on shared ownership and community housing schemes.
3. Size of development - preference for sites between 12-30 units and a larger number of smaller schemes rather than 60+ sites.
4. Preferred sites for development - preference for sites E and F. Take steps to mitigate impact of any developments on infrastructure, services and landscape.
5. Least preferred sites for development – Least preferred are D and B. Take steps to mitigate impact of any developments on infrastructure, services and landscape.
6. Sites suitable for industrial, commercial or retail - majority prefer site F for industrial, commercial or retail development.

### **Part 2 Employment**

7. Business premises - majority believe that more business premises are required but be aware that many villagers do not.
8. Types of business premises - preference for small workshops. Careful consideration required for other proposed business premises.

### **Environment and Sustainability**

9. Environment and sustainability - strong preference for protecting existing open green spaces. Support for improving footpaths, bus services and increasing green spaces. Opinion on traffic calming, flood protection measures and introducing cycle paths divided.

### **Community Assets**

10. GP/Co-op location - preference to move the GP surgery and Co-Op to a new location.
11. Recreation ground facilities - preference for children's playground and football pitch followed by pavilion and MUGA. Consider other suggestions and the possibility of upgrading existing facilities.
12. Venues for hire - existing venues for hire meet the village needs. However also consider creation of additional venues and upgrade of existing facilities.

13. Village facilities - there is highest demand for a pub serving good food, a restaurant and a café or tea room. Also popular are an ATM, gym/swimming pool, improved bus services/train station and a petrol station. Protecting the Post Office is also important. Consideration should also be given to the other suggestions made by respondents.
14. School/community facilities - preference for MUGA. Also support for indoor swimming pool. Least support for ecohuts.
15. Any other comments - consider suggestions within the general comments section and take note of concerns raised or opportunities identified.

C Longman  
January 2017

This document has been prepared in good faith on the basis of information available at the date of publication. Longman Planning Consultancy will not be liable for any loss, damage, cost or expense incurred or arising by reason of any person using or relying on information in this document.