

NP Supplementary Survey Results - June/July 2019

Surveys Received: **144**

Total Responses Agree/Disagree %	86%	14%
Total Responses	124	20
	Lower Shiplake	Shiplake Cross

Results for the Parish of SHIPLAKE:

	Q1. Do you agree, considering the information presented on the Survey Introduction page, that the Neighbourhood Plan should change to a criteria-based policy plan, rather than a site allocation plan?		Q2. Do you agree to amending one of the NP Objectives to read as above, to reflect the change to a criteria-based policy rather than a site allocation plan?		Q3. Do you agree with the proposal to introduce and amend a number of criteria-based policies to the NP, which will support good quality development that respects the character of the villages?	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
	Parish		Parish		Parish	
Total Responses Agree/Disagree %	96%	4%	96%	4%	97%	3%
Total Responses	138	6	138	6	139	5

	Do You agree to additional new policies covering the following topics?																			
	Q3.1 Conversion of buildings in the countryside		Q3.2 Special character areas		Q3.3 Riverside related development		Q3.4 Replacement dwellings		Q3.5 Density of development		Q3.6 Important Visual Aspects		Q3.7 Pre-application requirements		Q3.8 Building Materials		Q3.9 Landscaping and Environment		Q3.10 Infrastructure / Community Aspirations	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
	Parish		Parish		Parish		Parish		Parish		Parish		Parish		Parish		Parish		Parish	
Total Responses Agree/Disagree %	91%	9%	93%	7%	91%	9%	93%	7%	93%	7%	93%	7%	90%	10%	89%	11%	96%	4%	95%	5%
Total Responses	128	12	131	10	127	13	131	10	130	10	131	10	121	13	123	15	133	6	128	7

Results for the Parish of SHIPLAKE, Split by LOWER SHIPLAKE & SHIPLAKE CROSS:

	Q1. Do you agree, considering the information presented on the Survey Introduction page, that the Neighbourhood Plan should change to a criteria-based policy plan, rather than a site allocation plan?				Q2. Do you agree to amending one of the NP Objectives to read as above, to reflect the change to a criteria-based policy rather than a site allocation plan?				Q3. Do you agree with the proposal to introduce and amend a number of criteria-based policies to the NP, which will support good quality development that respects the character of the villages?					
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
	Lower Shiplake		Shiplake Cross		Lower Shiplake		Shiplake Cross		Lower Shiplake		Shiplake Cross			
Total Responses Agree/Disagree %	83%	3%	13%	1%	83%	3%	13%	1%	83%	3%	13%	1%		
Total Responses	119	5	19	1	119	5	19	1	120	4	19	1		

	Do You agree to additional new policies covering the following topics?																			
	Q3.1 Conversion of buildings in the countryside		Q3.2 Special character areas		Q3.3 Riverside related development		Q3.4 Replacement dwellings		Q3.5 Density of development		Q3.6 Important Visual Aspects		Q3.7 Pre-application requirements		Q3.8 Building Materials		Q3.9 Landscaping and Environment		Q3.10 Infrastructure / Community Aspirations	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
	LS		SC		LS		SC		LS		SC		LS		SC		LS		SC	
Total Responses Agree/Disagree %	79%	7%	12%	1%	81%	6%	12%	1%	79%	8%	12%	1%	81%	6%	13%	1%	80%	6%	13%	1%
Total Responses	111	10	17	2	114	8	17	2	110	11	17	2	113	9	18	1	112	9	18	1
	106	12	15	1	110	11	13	4	117	5	16	1	113	6	15	1	113	6	15	1

Q4: Comments By Lower Shiplake

I wonder if the plan needs a separate policy on industrial or business development in the villages

Please see email

Development along existing road frontages should be encouraged rather than back development which increases density of development and visual detriment to existing properties and detracts from the rural village character which Shiplake is struggling to retain.

Tree Preservation in the Village

At the moment a developer buys a block of land and comes in quickly removing every tree from the property before any preservation orders can be put in place. This is destroying the character of Lower Shiplake eg Baskerville Lane where all the original houses have trees and all the new houses have none as ALL have been removed.

We should have a policy which requires an application for tree removal

No further proposals.

Walking to school route, traversing that a bus enters the village for the purpose of taking children such a short distance to school.

20 mph throughout the village, complete waste of time as even villagers do not adhere to it!

It is of crucial importance that any new building that takes place does not increase the risk of flooding. No new riverside developments. Proper drainage of driveways, not just allowing run off into the river/flood plain. Use of grey water etc

Continue with your good work! Much appreciated.

Road safety for travellers in cars, pedestrians and cyclists

Pollution - particularly through increase of vehicles by residents and couriers

No

No

The above is agreed on the basis that there is a positive active approach taken to catering for the needs and aspirations of younger village residents / likely residents, to ensure the sustainability of the village ie some of the organic growth requires to be affordable housing in the true sense of the word!

I cannot agree to additional new policies in Q3 until I have seen them.

Impact on local amenities (schools, bus services, ..) and traffic considerations (density, danger, impact on established walk and cycle paths).

No

Not a policy comment, but survey is not HTTPS hence minimised ID provided.

No, major points well covered

I would hope this approach can help stop the continuing development of large houses and encourage smaller and more affordable homes.

Speeding near Memorial junction & congestion of parked cars on occasions (commuters) around the station area - If there is a need for the Fire Service to Bolney Road/Basmore Lane, there could be problems.

I don't think the policies should be prescriptive in the architectural direction or materials used as it reduces creativity and possibilities of potentially exciting buildings/houses. Some of the existing housing stock in Shiplake is extremely poor from an architectural point of view and we should not aim to think that because it has been there for years or something is a 'mock' period property that it is a good thing or something to aspire to.

I would reiterate the need for a comprehensive cycle and footpath plan. We need to think about reducing our carbon footprint as a responsible community.

Requirement for effective management of disruption during construction works to be part of planning approvals

- It is a great shame that more information was not available to study, so that an informed and considered response could be given. This explains why I have not been able to give any positive responses. I would have liked to give positive, or at least constructive responses but felt unable to with the paucity of detail provided

- I have to admit that my one overriding comment is that questions can be framed in certain ways so that a desired response is given. There is only one answer expected, the rest of the questionnaire relies on a positive response to this question

- No detailed explanation has been given as to why there has been such a fundamental shift in the PC's approach, who is going to form these policies and on what basis, taking into account what evidence, referring back to what NPPF policies

- You can't ask residents their opinion about such a fundamental shift in the NP without explaining what criteria/policies the NP and allocation of housing is going to be measured against

We agree with a criteria-based policy but wonder if the list above gives enough definition of the criteria suggested. e.g. Does 'Density of development' cover need for schools, GP practices, road and traffic systems, etc. If we've read it correctly without further definitions, the list has covered every criterion we can think of.

I don't feel able to answer Question 3 without either knowing the details of the policies or at least knowing that we will be given a chance to comment on them at a future date.

Apologies if I have missed something.

Encouragement of innovative architecture, materials, and energy-saving measures

No

I am not in favour of a criteria based approach to site selection as this leaves too much wriggle room and scope for other parties to over turn the wishes of the Local Community

No

Parking, Traffic and Road Junctions

Lighting

Villages and surrounding area remain rural, green gap between Henley and Shiplake villages to remain

Nuisance and remedies during work on developments

Adjoining Parishes and development

Parking, Traffic and Road Junctions

Adjoining Parishes and development

Lighting

Nuisance and remedies during work on developments

Villages and Surrounding area remain rural, green gap between Henley and Shiplake villages to remain

No

I would suggest adding:

- Parking and traffic

- Residents representation

Also:

In relation to 'infill' definition, we do need to be careful as I believe SODC (and other councils) have been pushing the boundaries of this definition over recent months to facilitate development on sites which would not previously have been considered infill. I would be happy to provide copy correspondence with SODC.

Whilst I am happy to agree that new policies would be beneficial, will the residents be consulted on what form these new policies might take?

Nil more to add

Ecological builds and general ecological wellbeing. But I don't think that these can be addressed as specific policies? but maybe as a general proviso, but well aware that we can't include everything we think of as can get too unwieldy.

Impact on rural roads / un-made up roads (eg New Road) which are

a) enjoyed as an amenity and a safe walking route to link Lower Shiplake to Shiplake, both for residents and also students attending Shiplake College

b) paid for by the residents for the upkeep

Impact on village amenities

ie development swamping the local resource eg parking for the station now littering the village

Is there a way we can ask developers to pay a levy for local impact ie massive lorries, roads closed, footpaths closed - unlikely I know!

No, but thanks for doing such important work on behalf of us all.

I gather that under the umbrella of community aspirations there is the requirement for downsizing and smaller houses for first time buyers and in particular young people who have lived in Shiplake for most of their lives? If this is the case then the other area that I would like you to address has already been covered. Thank you for all your hard work.

I'm not sure if there is scope for a policy on Communications; however there is a need for those developments agreed and commenced to have and share clearer plans for the project development and provide updates when timing or scope changes to that originally communicated- the current volume of developments in the village cause both traffic and noise issues, neither of which the developers in question seem to take ownership for, nor is there any means to gain clarity on timelines for construction work or again, to hold developers accountable for slippage and the additional inconvenience and intrusion upon neighbours and local residents. At present this seems to be solely down to individual relations vs a factor in development approval.

With the growth in population from Thames Farm and the old Wyvale site there needs to be significant investment in infrastructure such as medical facilities and schooling.

I don't know if the 'Landscape and Environment' topic covers the urgent need to preserve current wildlife corridors when choosing new build sites and the need to stop felling so many trees for new-builds in the village but it certainly should do.

No

Are plans going forward for redevelopment of the area/roads adjacent to the village shop/post office? Improving this area would enhance the environment for everyone in the village.

No

Dark skies policy. Too much lighting around the station.

Definitely no urbanisation of the village.

Car parking on pavements and constant commuter parking in quiet residential roads.

Parking and Traffic

Resident representation.

Protection of dark skies; protection of trees and vegetative screens. Recognition/ protection of certain important vistas that enhance the rural amenity eg from top of Mill Lane towards Kiln Lane. Enhance safer pedestrian access between the villages. Provision of recreational facilities more appropriate to teenagers. Policy on imposing gates and fences that feel oppressive and remove the rural village feel. Protection for the few stands of trees remaining in the village which may not contain 'significant' individuals warranting tpo's but as a group are of impto amenity value to villagers and wildlife.

Don't change house names.

Any new houses should have names in keeping with the history and geography of the area.

Representation of residents in matters affecting the community.

Retaining mature trees where possible, consideration of the aesthetic look on entering Shiplake on the A4155. The Station Road, Woodlands Road Junction. Three totally blind manoeuvres take place: turning right into Station Road, crossing from Woodlands Road to Station Road and turning right from Woodlands Road. In my 50 years of living in Shiplake it's still Russian Roulette.

Careful consideration of the street lighting design when Thames Farm building is underway to be in character with the rural environment.

A dark skies policy to limit light pollution in the villages and surrounding countryside.

Policies to ensure the villages and surrounding areas remain rural; villages are not overdeveloped and become urbanised

Parking policies to limit urbanisation

Pedestrian safety, especially at the top of Station Road and A4155 junction.

Tree preservation.

Road safety, especially along A4155.

Tree preservation.

On street parking

* I would underpin the "essential rural character" objective with a more specific policy that applies a strong presumption against development which creates creeping urbanisation and suburbanisation

* I think all development should be assessed in the context of the villages' fixed transport infrastructure

Policy to help keep each house individual. No house should be a clone of any other, but they should have similar character to surrounding buildings

Q4: Comments By Shiplake Cross

There must be some freedom and not totalitarian control.

None that I can think of.

Preservation and protection of the farmland.

Shiplake is a village, it should remain a village, therefore to commute to London is essential - The railway is all important - I was a regular commuter! Keep us green and happy!

No