

# North Crawley Neighbourhood Plan 2021 – 2036

**CONSULTATION STATEMENT**

**May 2022**



## Introduction

This consultation statement has been prepared in support of the North Crawley Neighbourhood Plan and should be read in conjunction with the main document and its evidence base.

A consultation statement is required under the Neighbourhood Planning regulations to identify the steps taken to consult interested parties on the plan, record the comments received, and identify any changes or actions that were taken as a result.

The North Crawley Neighbourhood Plan underwent an initial six-week period of pre-submission consultation between 5<sup>th</sup> December 2021 and 16<sup>th</sup> January 2022. A second consultation to include the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the historic environment took place between 4<sup>th</sup> April and 16<sup>th</sup> May 2022.

This consultation statement has been published to summarise both of the consultation periods by recording the comments received on the pre-submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan and the SEA.

The summary table overleaf outlines the comments received to the consultations and any consequent changes that were made to the Neighbourhood Plan and its supporting documents.

## Consultation Process

In addition to the 6 week pre-submission consultation, feedback was invited on the draft plan via the following methods during the preparation process:

1. Public meetings were held once a month between November 2019 and March 2020 (prior to the Covid Lockdown).
2. An information leaflet was distributed to all households in February 2021, with information about how to offer feedback.
3. Regular updates were posted on the Community Facebook page and emailed to those on the distribution list, with the opportunity to provide feedback.
4. A Neighbourhood Plan update was included as a standing item on the agenda for the monthly Parish Council meeting. It was also included in the monthly Parish Council article in SCAN magazine, which is hand delivered to all households in the Parish.
5. There were a series of Public Open Events in July 2021 and November 2021 with opportunities to provide feedback.

A questionnaire was hand delivered to all households in the Parish in 2017. The questionnaire results and feedback provided at the various consultation events were used to establish five main policy areas for the plan (housing, transport, heritage & design, landscape & greenspaces, and community facilities). Within each of these, policy-drafting was influenced by the following conclusions:

- The village's preference is for small-scale housing located within easy walking distance of the village centre.
- A range of house types incorporating those suitable for young families and the elderly should be provided.
- Traffic and its effect on the quality of life in North Crawley are a key concern.
- The rural surroundings of the village and its accessibility are highly valued.
- Residents are rightly proud of the heritage assets in the parish and these should be sustained and enhanced by any development and above all, protected from harm.

- Village amenities including sports facilities, pubs, and shop, should all be protected.

Site selections, heritage policies, and Local Green Space designations, were all developed using technical assessments that are submitted as evidence base documents alongside this consultation statement. The supporting documents were also consulted on during the pre-submission consultation and have been amended accordingly. Full details of how each were prepared are outlined in the individual documents.

All known landowners were written to at the start of the process to invite them to formally promote their sites and engage in the process. The availability of land therefore influenced which sites were considered in the site assessment process (see supporting document, Site options and Assessment, Appendix 5 to the Neighbourhood Plan).

The landowners/agents of the five allocated sites have had the opportunity to discuss with the SG the Design Guides and indicative plans for their respective sites. Some of the indicative designs were provided by the landowners/agents and have been incorporated into the Design Guides evidence document (Appendix 6 to the Neighbourhood Plan).

During the latter stages of the process, the Steering Group were informed by the landowners of site H3 that the indicative designs were no longer acceptable. The SG engaged with the landowners and their consultant to ensure that the new plans were acceptable to all, that the Neighbourhood Plan objectives were not compromised and that the site was viable and thus developable. A leaflet with information about the changes was delivered to all households in the Parish and an open day was held to ensure that everyone was consulted and had the opportunity to provide feedback. Subsequent to this, the Conservation and Archaeology Department at Milton Keynes Council, requested a number of amendments to the strategies and policies affecting site H3, to ensure that the designated heritage assets, located at Old Moat Farm, will be protected from harm and that the Neighbourhood Plan policies are consistent with those contained in Plan:MK (2019). These amendments are detailed in the table below.

All additional feedback from residents and other stakeholders has been recorded and responded to in Q&A documents that have been published on the Community Facebook page and are available on the Parish Council website.

## Screening

In addition to engagement carried out by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group with the local community and landowners, Milton Keynes Council has also consulted the Environment Agency, Natural England, and Historic England on whether the Neighbourhood Plan requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment. This screening exercise identified that a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) was required, owing to a potential for significant environmental effects relating to heritage assets, the focus of the SEA is limited to this aspect.

The Environment Agency and Natural England agreed with the Local Authority and the Parish Council that in respect to their areas of interest, there are no significant environmental effects.

## Pre-submission consultation

Table 1 below (page 4) summarises the comments received during the pre-submission consultation in December 2021/January 2022 and the response of the Steering Group in either making amendments or justifying the existing policy/evidence.

The initial pre-submission consultation, in December/January was advertised by:

- hand delivering a letter explaining the consultation process along with a copy of the pre-submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan to all households within the Parish of North Crawley;
- sending an electronic copy of the pre-submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan and the letter explaining the consultation process to all those on the email distribution lists. The regular email distribution list includes landowners, residents and other stakeholders who have previously expressed an interest in being kept up to date on the Neighbourhood Plan. An additional distribution list was set up to include all of the schedule 1 statutory bodies and neighbouring parish councils in the consultation;
- posting the Neighbourhood Plan document and letter on the North Crawley Community Facebook page;
- including the consultation process as an agenda item at the Parish Council meeting and posting all of the documents on the Parish Council website.

Following the initial consultation, the consultation document, including all comments received with associated responses and details of any amendments to the Neighbourhood Plan documentation, was made available electronically, and in hard copy by request to the Clerk to the Parish Council. All amended documents were made available on the Parish Council website.

The second pre-submission consultation, in April/May 2022, including the SEA, was advertised by:

- hand delivering a letter, explaining the background to the SEA and the 2<sup>nd</sup> consultation process, to all households within the Parish of North Crawley;
- sending an electronic copy of the amended pre-submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan, the SEA and the letter explaining the consultation process to all those on the email distribution lists. The regular email distribution list includes landowners, residents and other stakeholders who have previously expressed an interest in being kept up to date on the Neighbourhood Plan. An additional distribution list was set up to include all of the schedule 1 statutory bodies and neighbouring parish councils in the consultation;
- posting the Neighbourhood Plan document, the SEA and the consultation letter on the North Crawley Community Facebook page;
- including the consultation process as an agenda item at the Parish Council meeting and posting all of the documents on the Parish Council website.

Submissions received to the second consultation can be found in Table 2 (page 27).

**Table 1.**

**Residents and other stakeholders were given the opportunity to attend 2 drop in sessions during both consultation periods. A total of 7 residents and 1 landowner attended the first drop-in sessions in December and January. A range of views was expressed, these are anonymised and summarised below:**

2 Residents	<p>Concerns expressed about site H3, Top Croft, on Chicheley Road. Although the residents understand that the Steering Group has a difficult task and are trying to carry it out fairly, they do not feel they can vote in favour of any proposed plan that narrows the gap between the Crawleys, Magna and Parva (or, therefore, which includes that site).</p> <p>Specific concerns relate to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Drainage/sewerage already struggling to cope. This will make things worse.</li><li>2. Vehicular access will be impossible or, at least, hazardous if the road is not widened.</li><li>3. Pedestrian access could possibly have been part of the solution but, instead, it is only achieved through the Maslin site.</li><li>4. The developer will inevitably want to expand the development into Bottom Croft sooner or later.</li><li>5. Every reason that the Moat Farm site was rejected applies equally to Top Croft.</li><li>6. Construction traffic will cause significant disruption for the duration of the build</li></ol>	<p>The Steering Group does appreciate that not all sites will be acceptable to all residents and it has tried to be as objective as possible when selecting suitable sites. Site H3 allows the neighbourhood plan to fulfil the requirement for affordable homes and in that sense, it makes a valuable contribution to the overall allocation.</p> <p>Please see formal submissions from residents in Table 1 below, for a detailed response to these comments.</p>
-------------	---	--

NORTH CRAWLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – CONSULTATION STATEMENT

<p>2 Residents</p>	<p>Concerned that the development of the Maslin site on Orchard Way doesn't overshadow bungalows close by.</p> <p>Grateful to the Steering Group for all their hard work.</p>	<p>The specification is for bungalows and 1.5 storey houses on this site. The indicative plan in the Design Guides document shows bungalows facing Orchard Way, this plan was provided by the developer and it is their intention to minimise harm to existing properties.</p> <p>Comments noted with thanks.</p>
<p>2 Residents</p>	<p>H7 concerns included: potential to develop the site further, traffic issues related to cars turning out of the site into Folly Lane, impact of views.</p> <p>Thanked members of the Steering Group for their hard work.</p>	<p>The settlement boundary has been drawn immediately to the south of the proposed bungalows, to ensure that the land that includes the access to the properties will remain outside the settlement boundary and thus be classed as open countryside. The access to the site is located in an area where there is an existing footpath and so there is additional width at this point for creating suitable visibility splays. The access is not opposite existing driveways.</p> <p>The impact on views will be minimised by building single storey dwellings and maintaining existing hedgerows directly in front of the bungalows. The remainder of the site will be landscaped to make a positive contribution to this rural entrance to the village.</p> <p>Comments noted with thanks.</p>
<p>1 Resident</p>	<p>He had read the pre-submission version with interest and felt he had learnt a lot from it (not just about the process and the proposals, but also about the village itself). He was very impressed by the quality of the work in the pre-submission version and very grateful for the efforts of the Steering Group.</p> <p>He had some particular points of curiosity:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. to what extent are the designs indicative of what will ultimately be built;</li> <li>2. what happens if a site within an adopted Plan does not get developed;</li> </ol>	<p>Comments noted with thanks.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The indicative designs are exactly that, they give an indication of the viability of a site for development. Having said that, landowners and/or their representatives, including developers have been involved in the development of the designs and those for sites H4, H5 and H7 have been provided by the developer. The plans for site H3 have also been approved by a developer, however, there are likely to be amendments relating to the requirements of the Conservation and Archaeology Department at MKC.</li> <li>2. The Steering Group and the Parish Council are keen that all sites are developed as planned, to ensure that the objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan are fulfilled. The Steering Group has worked with landowners/ developers to ensure that the</li> </ol>

NORTH CRAWLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – CONSULTATION STATEMENT

	<p>3. what are the main differences between this Plan and the previous one;</p> <p>4. was the village seeking to include more housing than MK wanted/required from us?</p>	<p>sites that have been allocated are viable and there is no indication that the sites will not be developed. Milton Keynes Council policies and the Neighbourhood plan policies will still apply to the site even if it remains undeveloped.</p> <p>3. The site allocations have changed from the 2019 version of the plan. The number of houses allocated within the Plan remains the same but the specific locations have changed, with the addition of two further sites.</p> <p>4. Yes. MKC require Neighbourhood Plans to allocate a minimum of 1 dwelling. A decision was made by the Parish Council, following consultation that in order to ensure that the village is sustainable into the future that 30 to 35 houses were needed to support young people and young families to live in the village. MKC have supported this allocation stating that “Milton Keynes Council has set an indicative housing figure of 1 home for all neighbourhood plans in the Borough. It is, however, important to note that this is not a maximum figure and neighbourhood plans are encouraged to plan positively for development in their areas, including allocating more development, where that is sustainable and in general conformity with the development strategy of Plan:MK. The Council believes that an allocation of up to 35 dwellings in North Crawley is sustainable and in general conformity with the development strategy of Plan:MK.”</p>
<p>1 Landowner</p>	<p>Recognised the difficult job of creating a Neighbourhood Plan and was grateful for the consultation and communication. He was concerned that small landowners were left out of the plan and found it hard to accept that land on the edge of the village was not included in the Neighbourhood Plan. He felt that small landowners were left with pockets of land that they could not utilise.</p>	<p>Milton Keynes Council policies state that new development in rural areas will take place within settlement boundaries. Suitable sites for housing allocation in Neighbourhood Plans must be sited within or close to the existing settlement boundary, so that when the settlement boundary is re-drawn to include the new housing allocations, it does not then include land that is not suitable for development.</p> <p>Milton Keynes Councils policies on windfall and infill development may allow sites that are not allocated, to come forward for development.</p>

<b>Written consultation responses January 2022</b>				
<b>The full text of each submission has not been included. Below, pertinent extracts relating to the plan in general and/or policies within the Neighbourhood Plan have been highlighted with the response from the Steering Group. The complete correspondences are available on the Neighbourhood Plan page of the Parish Council website – <a href="https://www.northcrawley-pc.gov.uk/">https://www.northcrawley-pc.gov.uk/</a>.</b>				
<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Policy No</b>	<b>Key Points</b>	<b>Steering Group Response</b>
Chris Toye	Resident		<p>I appreciate that the current plan has followed all the correct routes and, in most instances, you have been left with a limited number of so called viable areas of land, but that doesn't make it the right option for the village.</p> <p>We have seen the allocation now of one large estate, H3, which has further increased in the number of dwellings from the original draft. This type of site goes directly against what the villagers voted for in the original referendum. This feeling was also made clear in several of the open forum meetings, yet we have continued regardless.</p> <p>A total of 30 proposed dwellings to one corner of the village, is not balancing out development around the village settlement boundary. The site is clearly going to have a detrimental effect on the Chichley Road, not to mention it remains a site next door to Moat Farm which retains a listed status and a building of substantial historical value.</p> <p>By agreeing to this increase in dwellings you have left yourself with nowhere to negotiate to reduce/remove another site. The number of dwellings is now over what is required.</p>	<p>The Steering Group (SG) were tasked with writing a neighbourhood plan that would bring forward 30 to 35 new homes over the next 15 years. Amongst the objectives arising from the 2017 residents' questionnaire, the SG sought to make some of these homes affordable and smaller in size, to allow young people to own their first home and older people to downsize, thus freeing up larger homes in the village.</p> <p>In order to achieve a quantum of affordable homes, a development of 11 or more dwellings is required. You rightly acknowledge that the SG has had a limited number of potentially suitable sites to consider and finding a suitable site that will accommodate a larger development has been one of the greatest challenges.</p> <p>The site assessment process, carried out independently, made clear why some sites were suitable and others not. The equal distribution of development around the village proved impossible for a number of reasons; chiefly, insufficient sites with defensible boundaries to accommodate the number of dwellings required, but also such other constraints as safe access, heritage issues, etc. As you rightly observe, included sites such as H3 are not entirely free of such constraints either. By contrast, however, where they exist, it has been</p>



			<p>The continued rhetoric of “we have no other options of land”, again doesn’t make this plan the right option.</p> <p>The village will obviously decide how they wish to proceed but given the current status of development in and around Milton Keynes, opposing planning applications in open countryside and allowing infill sites, still remains the best form of retaining the village community.</p> <p>Make no mistake, if we approve development in partial sections of these substantial fields, they will be lost in their entirety.</p>	<p>assessed that they can be effectively mitigated on those sites.</p> <p>Since publishing the draft document, discussions have taken place with the Conservation and Archaeology team at Milton Keynes Council (MKC) and as a result, the policies for site H3 have changed significantly. The preferred density is for 15 dwellings, with the potential for up to 20 only if the scheme is considered sympathetic to its location and exceptional in design. The significance of the rural setting of the heritage assets at Moat Farm will be an important influence on whether or not a proposal is acceptable. Historic England are also taking a keen interest in this site. Accordingly, inclusion of site H3 is capable of achieving the objectives of the NP, including providing affordable homes, while at the same time protecting the rural approach to the village and enhancing the setting of the heritage assets.</p> <p>MKC are in agreement with the SG that further development to the north of site H3 will not be acceptable. The fields between site H3 and Little Crawley will remain an important green buffer to prevent coalescence between the hamlet and the village and to further protect the setting of Moat Farm.</p> <p>The issue of traffic throughout North Crawley has been a significant consideration for the Parish Council. The SG recognises that this issue is not going to go away; indeed, it is certain to get worse. All of the sites will have an impact on traffic levels. However, the assessment of site H3 concluded that suitable vehicular access from Chicheley Road, with</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>the required visibility splays, could be created. The exact layout of the entrance will be a matter for the Highways Department at Milton Keynes Council to decide.</p> <p>It is true that we could dispense with the plan and rely upon Milton Keynes Council policies to protect development in the open countryside but infill, within the settlement boundary, will not bring forward more than a handful of houses, there is simply not enough room. In addition, this will not allow for affordable homes or smaller bungalows to be built. The infill that has been allowed in the last 10 years has resulted in a house on Chicheley Road that does not sit well with the surrounding houses and a small number of agricultural buildings that have been repurposed, many of them outside of the settlement boundary and rented out on short term lets, which does not contribute to a sustainable community.</p> <p>The SG has listened to a wide range of views over the last two years; and amendments have been made to the plan as a result. However, the allocation of affordable housing must remain if we are to fulfil one of the key objectives; to provide suitable homes for young people and families.</p> <p>The population of the parish has decreased in the last 20 years, it has also aged considerably. The Neighbourhood Plan is focused on the future of North Crawley; ensuring that the pubs, shop, church, school and clubs and societies continue to thrive while at the same time, looking after the heritage and the landscape that make our village so special.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

NORTH CRAWLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – CONSULTATION STATEMENT

				<p>As you have said, the Steering Group had only a limited number of potentially viable sites, and every effort was made to ensure that the process was followed correctly. It was our responsibility to produce a viable NP that responded appropriately to the many different – and even sometimes conflicting – objectives. We believe that the pre-submission version successfully balances and meets those objectives, and that any meaningfully different approach is impossible without departing from some of those objectives or from current planning policy. Ultimately, residents will decide whether or not it is the right option for the village. Inevitably some residents will object, and that is perfectly understandable.</p> <p>If this plan does not go ahead the Parish Council has made it clear there will not be another. However, it remains the view of the Parish Council that a neighbourhood plan provides the best available safeguard for the interests of the residents, young and old, and against development that is primarily driven by landowners without the checks and balances a neighbourhood plan could have provided. Cranfield is often held as an example of what can happen as a consequence of having no such management of expansion.</p>
Karen and Andy Foster	Resident	H3	<p>Firstly, we wish to thank all those that have volunteered their time to work on the neighbourhood plan for North Crawley.</p> <p>Further to the drop-in session of Sat 8th Jan 2022 we detail below our written comments specific to Site H3, Top Croft, Chicheley Road.</p>	<p>Comments noted, with thanks.</p> <p>Many of the points raised are answered in the response above, additional points are responded to below:</p>

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We hold major reservation on the number of houses all on one site and feel the size of the proposed development is too big for the village. This will have significant strain on existing infrastructure, for example drainage, water, broadband etc.</li> <li>2. The larger the development the bigger the impact will be on the village and specifically on those living close to it.</li> <li>3. We believe there will be a significant impact on the environment and community during construction due to the time it would take to complete the proposed number of houses, all concentrated on one location.</li> <li>4. The visual impact of the new development is mentioned from Moat Farm and North Crawley, however residence in Little Crawley will also have a visual impact if the development is to go ahead. There will be a visual impact on what is currently open countryside</li> <li>5. This development would significantly close the gap between North Crawley and Little Crawley. We believe any development at site H3 compromises the identify of Little Crawley in its own right and also compromises the settlement boundary.</li> <li>6. Creating vehicular access directly onto Chicheley Road we believe will create a danger to all road users, exacerbating existing issues with traffic and the speed of vehicles as they enter and leave the village. Despite assurances to the contrary, good visibility from a new junction will be difficult to achieve.</li> </ol>	<p>Consultation has taken place with the statutory bodies respectively responsible for water, drainage, communications, highways, etc. All of them are aware of the potential for an additional 30 to 35 homes to come forward in the village and the need to ensure appropriate infrastructure is in place to accommodate this. Anglian Water are aware of the proposed increase in housing and have assured us that North Crawley is a focus for further investment to accommodate growth in the next few years.</p> <p>Before a development application is approved, the developer will have to show that the scheme has an appropriate surface water drainage scheme in place. In the case of site H3, one possible solution which has been suggested is for this to be associated with the pond and wildlife area. Similarly, the proposal will have to demonstrate safe vehicular access before the Highways Department will agree to development taking place.</p> <p>With regard to a pedestrian footpath along Chicheley Road, this would require removing a large swathe of hedgerow along the front of the site and would also require purchasing a large section of third party land from the front garden of number 28, Chicheley Road. A more sustainable solution is to connect a well-lit pedestrian walkway with the public footpath through to Orchard Way, via site H4. While the details of this will be worked out as part of a successful development proposal, there is a willingness from the developers of the respective</p>
--	--	--	--	--

NORTH CRAWLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – CONSULTATION STATEMENT

			<p>7. Drainage issues in Little Crawley will not be improved by development at this site. The property at the corner of Gog Lane and Chicheley Road was flooded with surface water from Top and Lower Croft fields in December 2020. We see no mitigation in the current plan that will improve this situation.</p> <p>8. During any period of construction there will be an approved route for all construction vehicles that is closest to a major road. This will mean all construction traffic will most likely pass along Chicheley Road from the Bedford Road, again having significant impact on the residence along this route.</p> <p>9. Why is there no planned footpath along Chicheley Road from Orchard Way to the vehicular entrance to the proposed site?</p> <p>10. Where site H3, H4 and H5 converge would need very careful management between developers to ensure the overall look and feel of the site is maintained in accordance with planning stipulations. How this management could be achieved is not addressed in the plan, however each site is being proposed on the basis that this co-operation will be in place.</p> <p>11. Recently there was a proposal to develop a site at junction of Chicheley Road and The High Street/Brook End (Moat Farm). All of the reasons given against this development are as valid as the proposal to site H3, Top Croft.</p>	<p>sites to ensure that the schemes work together effectively.</p> <p>The SG recognises that there will be some disruption in the construction phase of development. Additional traffic movement is an issue that will affect residents in all areas of the village and the Parish Council is already working with developers responsible for the large housing projects at Tickford Fields and the Milton Keynes East development to try to manage vehicular movements through the village. There will be restrictions on when construction work can take place and it is usual to ensure that work at weekends and in the early morning and evenings is not allowed.</p> <p>The SG and the PC believe that this NP provides small scale, manageable growth for at least the next 15 years. It will protect the village from speculative development and provide opportunities for older residents to downsize while remaining in the village and also provide more homes suitable for young families.</p>
Callum Fisk By email	Lone Star Land, representing	N/A	Lone Star Land (LSL) are writing in support of the North Crawley Neighbourhood Plan. LSL are Land promoters based in Henley-in-Arden, who have an active interest	Comments noted, with thanks.

NORTH CRAWLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – CONSULTATION STATEMENT

	the North Crawley Estate		<p>in the North Crawley NP, as we act on behalf of the North Crawley Estate (the Landowner). LSL support both the housing allocations H5 and H7, which have been allocated in the draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Firstly, we welcome this new Neighbourhood Plan and wish to commend the Steering Group’s resilience and thorough approach to their site selection process. We believe they have included a range of suitable, deliverable and developable sites which will help the village grow organically in the future.</p>	
		Policy H5	<p>LSL supports policy H5, Land North of Orchard Way, which is allocated for residential development of five dwellings. The site is deliverable and developable and five of the six criteria are generally supported. Appendix six – North Crawley Site Design Guide shows an indicative layout with access through H4; we can confirm that the landowner has a right of access through H4. The fifth criterion is deliverable.</p> <p>Regarding the sixth criterion, LSL seek a minor change to the policy wording. The requirement to leave a distance of 15m between the off-site foul pumping station and the curtilage of any dwelling is not justified and unreasonable. Neither is it supported by the accompanying Site Design guide in which the indicative layout shows gardens/buildings associated with the nearest plot within a 15m zone. Any off-set distance should be informed by a noise assessment at a future planning application stage.</p> <p>We consider this bullet point should be amended to “Consider the proximity of the foul pumping station in the design and layout of the scheme and allow for a suitable separation distance to reduce the risk of</p>	<p>The wording for this aspect of the policy was provided by Anglian Water. In the submission to the 2019 consultation the representative stated: “Development located within 15m of the pumping station would be at risk of nuisance in the form of noise, odour or the general disruption from maintenance work caused by the normal operation of the pumping station.”</p> <p>The Steering Group agrees that the proposed amendment to the policy wording is acceptable and the policy will be amended accordingly.</p>

			nuisance/loss of amenity associated with the operation of the pumping station.”	
		Policy H7	<p>LSL supports Policy H7 with a modification to the wording of the policy regarding heritage. Policy H7 allocates land for residential development for two bungalows and we can confirm that the site is deliverable and developable. The five criteria set out in the policy can be accommodated albeit with a modification to the fifth criteria. The fifth criteria of policy H7 goes above and beyond national policy as it states, “to sustain and enhance the significance of the Grade 2 listed old Rectory and the Conservation area”. However, in accordance with paragraph 202 of the NPPF, if a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. As a result, policy H7 should be amended to reflect paragraph 202 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>Plan MK Section 13 ‘Heritage’ paragraphs 13.6 to 13.15 are relevant.</p> <p>13.8 Heritage assets rarely prevent development schemes where their significance has been properly assessed and understood from the outset.</p> <p>13.9 A clear understanding of the significance of a heritage asset and its setting is necessary to develop proposals which avoid or minimise harm. Early appraisals, a conservation plan or targeted specialist investigation can help to identify constraints and opportunities arising from the asset at an early stage. ... Such schemes are more likely to minimise harm and deliver public benefits in a sustainable and appropriate way. Reports on heritage assets must be proficient, objective and impartial in order to be of greatest value to the decision making process.</p> <p>13.12 The Council considers it desirable that the significance of its heritage assets be sustained and enhanced by all proposals. Where proposals cause harm to heritage assets, they will be considered using the criteria, weighing exercises and balanced judgements set out in the NPPF, depending on the type of asset and the degree of harm.</p> <p>Policy HE1 ‘HERITAGE AND DEVELOPMENT’ states: A. Proposals will be supported where they sustain and, where possible, enhance the significance of heritage assets which are recognised as being of</p>

NORTH CRAWLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – CONSULTATION STATEMENT

				<p>historic, archaeological, architectural, artistic, landscape or townscape significance.</p> <p>Following discussions with MKC Conservation and Archaeology Department, the wording in Policy H7 has been amended, it now reads:          “Any development proposals should prepare a (Plan:MK, policy HE1(B) compliant) heritage assessment explaining how the new development will sustain and where possible enhance the significance of the Grade 2 Listed Old Rectory and the adjacent Conservation Area.”</p>
Matt Verlander	Avison Young on behalf of National Grid	N/A	An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid’s electricity and gas transmission assets, which include high voltage electricity assets and high-pressured gas pipelines. National Grid has identified that it has no record of such assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area.	Noted
Sharon Jenkins	Natural England	N/A	At this time, Natural England is not able to fully assess the potential impacts of this plan on statutory nature conservation sites or protected landscapes or, provide detailed advice in relation to this consultation. If you consider there are significant risks to statutory nature conservation sites or protected landscapes, please set out the specific areas on which you require advice. The lack of detailed advice from Natural England does not imply that there are no impacts on the natural environment. It is for the deciding authority to determine whether or not the plan is consistent with national and local environmental policies. Other bodies and individuals may provide information and advice on the impacts of the plan on the natural environment to assist the decision making process.	<p>Noted</p> <p>MKC are currently consulting on the requirement for a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)</p>



NORTH CRAWLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – CONSULTATION STATEMENT

			<p>Natural England does not routinely maintain locally specific data on all potential environmental assets. As a result the responsible authority should raise environmental issues that we have not identified on local or national biodiversity action plan species and/or habitats, local wildlife sites or local landscape character, with its own ecological and/or landscape advisers, local record centre, recording society or wildlife body on the local landscape and biodiversity receptors that may be affected by this plan, before determining whether an SA/SEA is necessary.</p> <p>Please note that Natural England reserves the right to provide further comments on the environmental assessment of the plan beyond this SEA/SA screening stage, should the responsible authority seek our views on the scoping or environmental report stages. This includes any third party appeal against any screening decision you may make.</p>	
Mike Braithwaite	RDC Consultancy Representing landowners of site H3	Policy H3	<p>We note the policy states the land is allocated for a development “of 20 dwellings” should a development come forward that is otherwise acceptable but is not for 20 dwellings, whether this is 19 or 21, this could be a reason to refuse the application. We would suggest the policy reads “ a development of approximately” or “up to” 20 dwellings.</p>	<p>Please note the amendment to the wording regarding the number of dwellings, following discussions with the Conservation and Archaeology Department at Milton Keynes Council this now reads: ‘about 15 dwellings, with the potential to achieve up to 20 if a (Plan:MK, policy HE1(B) compliant) heritage assessment indicates that a sympathetic, context specific scheme can be brought forward without causing additional harm to the designated heritage assets.’</p>
David Blandamer	Planning Department Milton Keynes Council	Para 2.5	<p>Should reference to the allotments on Folly Lane also be included?</p>	<p>Yes. The allotments are owned and administered by the North Crawley United Charities. A paragraph has been added noting the importance of the allotments to the community.</p>

NORTH CRAWLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – CONSULTATION STATEMENT

		Para 3.1.3	should read “a development of more than 11 houses will be required to provide some affordable housing in accordance with Plan:MK (2019) Policies HN1, and HN2”.	Noted- amendment agreed
		Para 3.1.8	this wording doesn’t reflect the advice that was provided. Whilst we agreed that it is appropriate for North Crawley to allocate more homes than the indicative figure, that was not because of the SHMA. I would suggest that the following wording more closely follows the advice given: “Milton Keynes Planning Officers have agreed that it is appropriate for North Crawley to allocate more than the required number of new homes, provided it is sustainable and in general conformity with the development strategy of Plan:MK.”	Noted – amendment agreed
		Policy H1	Third paragraph amend to read: “New housing will be delivered through: • Dwellings with planning consent at January 2021 or which have been constructed since January 2021 • .....	Noted. Amendment agreed
		Policy H2	The criterion “development of residential gardens, for example, where development would cause harm to the local area” is too imprecise and would be impossible for decision makers to interpret. The intention of the wording in para 71 of NPPF is that plans should consider drafting policies that resist inappropriate development of residential gardens. However, such policies need to identify what inappropriate development is and what harm would be caused.  The second paragraph of Policy H2 states that proposals for windfall development of single dwellings on brownfield sites located outside of the settlement boundary will be supported by the Neighbourhood Plan	Noted. Policy H2 has been amended to conform to Plan:MK Policies DS2 and DS5.  Amended wording for Policy H2: “Proposals within the settlement boundary that are not on allocated sites (i.e., ‘windfall’ developments) will be supported where they represent an appropriate form of infill. Inappropriate infilling includes proposals that result in the loss of open space, including Local Green Spaces; development that would adversely affect the special interest, character, or appearance of the conservation area (or the significance of other heritage assets); intensification of existing uses where this has

			<p>(provided certain criteria are met). It is our view that this is not in accordance with strategic policies DS2 and DS5 of Plan:MK.</p> <p>Policy DS2 outlines the housing strategy for the Borough and, incorporates the Council’s strategy/policy for the development of Brownfield Sites and for development within the rural area of the Borough. These are specially outlined in Parts A11 and A13 of Policy DS2 (full wording of these criteria are outlined below) which, encourage the redevelopment of brownfield sites within the Milton Keynes urban area and, support residential developments that are focused within defined settlement boundaries and comply with other relevant policies of Plan:MK and the neighbourhood plan. Policy H2 of the NCNP, in allowing for development of brownfield sites in the rural area of the Borough and outside of settlement boundaries does not therefore comply with the strategy outlined in Plan:MK’s strategic Policy DS2.</p> <p>Policy DS5 outlines the Council’s strategy for land designated as open countryside (which is outlined as all land outside the development boundaries defined on the Policies Map). Part A of Policy DS5 states that planning permission will only be granted within the open countryside for development which is essential and appropriate to a rural area and cannot be located within a settlement. The provision of single dwelling windfall developments would not comply with Policy DS5, as such, it is considered that Policy H2 of the NCNP, in allowing for this type of development within the</p>	<p>adverse impacts on amenity or privacy; development that would cause harm to the local area by reducing gaps between existing dwellings, removing valuable wildlife habitat, including the loss of significant trees and hedgerow and impacting on the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties; and developments that are inconsistent with the design principles of Policies HD1 and HD2.</p> <p>Proposals for developments in residential gardens within the settlement boundary will be supported where there is no negative impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Any such development must offer appropriate access and incorporate adequate off street parking and amenity space in accordance with MKC guidelines.</p> <p>Proposals for developments in residential gardens will not be supported where the inappropriate development of the site would adversely affect the amenity of future occupiers of the site or those currently occupying adjoining or nearby properties, or where the garden makes an important contribution to the local landscape, for example by providing views into open countryside.</p> <p>Applications for replacement dwellings within and outside the settlement boundary will be supported where they comply with all other relevant policies of Plan:MK and the NPPF.”</p>
--	--	--	---	---

NORTH CRAWLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – CONSULTATION STATEMENT

			<p>open countryside, is not in compliance with Plan:MK’s strategic Policy DS5.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that Policy H2 should be reconsidered and amended to remove the elements which conflict with strategic Policies DS2 and DS5 of Plan:MK.</p> <p>As well as this element of Policy H2 being considered to not be in general conformity with the strategic policies of Plan:MK, there also appears to be limited, to no evidence which assesses the potential impact of such a policy. No background work appears to have been carried out to investigate the potential sites that could come forward under this policy, nor the scale of supply that could be delivered by this source (particularly considering residential gardens are considered to be previously developed, brownfield land and, would therefore be suitable for development under this policy). Furthermore, there is no assessment of the potential detrimental impact that the delivery of these types of development, both individually and cumulatively, may have on the character of the open countryside.</p>	
		Para 3.1.23	<p>A local connection requirement can only be applied to an element of the Affordable Housing and not the market sale properties. This is not technically correct – it could be applied to market housing under particular conditions/ policies.</p> <p>First Homes are a form of discounted market housing, which meet the definition of ‘affordable housing’ for planning purposes. I would amend para 3.1.23 to read “A local connection requirement can only be applied to</p>	<p>Many thanks for the clarification; the suggested amendment is agreed.</p>

NORTH CRAWLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – CONSULTATION STATEMENT

			an element of the Affordable Housing” to avoid any ambiguity.	
		Policy H3	<p>Policy H3 prescribes a tenure mix of 40% 2 bedroom homes, 40% 3 bedroom family homes, and 20% 4 bedroom family homes. It would be useful for the prescribed tenure mixture to be given a rationale to aid the decision makers understanding including information about what evidence the neighbourhood plan group has used to inform this mix. The decision maker will be referring to Policy HN1 and the recommended housing mix of the Council’s most recent Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (2017) which is outlined in table 7.1 in Plan:MK when assessing proposals.</p> <p>Might it be better to say “Proposals should include predominantly 2-bedroom homes and 3-bedroom family homes, with some 4-bedroom family homes.”</p> <p>First Homes are a specific kind of discounted market sale housing and should be considered to meet the definition of ‘affordable housing’ for planning purposes. National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) sets out detailed guidance relating to First Homes. First Homes are the government’s preferred discounted market tenure and should account for at least 25% of all affordable housing units delivered by developers through planning obligations.</p>	<p>Amended wording agreed</p> <p>The Steering Group would welcome the inclusion of First Homes in the Neighbourhood Plan. Currently, First Homes are not included in the definition of affordable housing in Plan:MK (2019), this situation may change in the near future and so paragraph 3.1.23 has been added to the Neighbourhood Plan, it reads: ‘First Homes are a specific kind of discounted market sale housing and should be considered to meet the definition of ‘affordable housing’ for planning purposes. National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) sets out detailed guidance relating to First Homes.’</p>
		Policy H6	Question the requirement for dwellings to be 1.5 storeys given the context is of 2 storey dwellings. The	Noted. Paragraph 3.1.19 has been added to the Neighbourhood Plan, by way of explanation: ‘Site

NORTH CRAWLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – CONSULTATION STATEMENT

			<p>Site Design Guides states 1.5 storeys, but also to be in keeping with the height of surrounding houses. It would be better for the policy to state that dwellings should be in keeping with the height, form and massing of surrounding dwellings.</p>	<p>H6 lies within the Conservation Area and it is important that development on this site is sympathetic to the context of this character area. The height of new dwellings is an important consideration in a proposed scheme. Surrounding properties include 1.5-storey (as well as 2-storey) dwellings, including the estate cottages typical of the area; one of which is listed. The site is also one of the entrances to the village and part of the transition into the conservation area from the open countryside to the south and east of the village, with coincident impact on views that include the church. Even the majority of neighbouring two-storey dwellings (mostly contained in a 19th century row of terraced cottages) are markedly smaller in height than modern 2-storey dwellings. Neighbourhood Plan policies will not support the addition of any further new housing that exceeds the height of the majority of surrounding rooflines.'</p> <p>Amended policy wording now reads: 'Dwellings should be in keeping with the height, form and massing of surrounding dwellings but not exceeding 1.5 storeys, to minimise landscape and heritage impacts and harm to the outlooks of existing properties.'</p>
		Policy H8	<p>Remove word 'initially' from policy wording. The current wording suggests that subsequent relets will not be to people with a local connection.</p> <p>I previously informally suggested that you should include something along the lines of "Proposals for 11 or more homes should provide 31% of those homes as</p>	<p>Noted. Amendment agreed.</p> <p>Thanks for the clarification, amendments agreed.</p>

NORTH CRAWLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – CONSULTATION STATEMENT

			affordable housing” at the beginning of H8. I know it’s repeating what’s in Plan:MK, but it just provides a bit more context for what follows. I also wondered whether 25% of affordable housing having a local connection was what you intended. This would only likely affect 1-2 properties (25% of 31% of 20 dwellings on site H3). Julia Banham has informed me that if you wanted to say up to 50% we would not have a problem.	
		Section 3.3	The Conservation Area Review document was agreed at a Delegated Decision meeting on 7 December. References in the Plan should be amended to refer to the December 2021 document and to remove any references to it being a draft document.	Noted. Amendment agreed
		Policy L1	As I have mentioned previously, I am dubious about the Orchard Way verge meeting the NPPF criteria, but I’m happy for you to make a case to convince the Neighbourhood Plan examiner.	Noted – see Local Green Space Assessment, (Appendix 7 to the NP).
		Para 3.5.2	States that the Policy CC3 of Plan:MK will only support the loss of community facilities where either of two criteria are met. The second criterion states “an acceptable alternative facility can be provided elsewhere”. However, this is not reflected in the Neighbourhood Plan policy. Is there any reason why this has not been included?  Many Neighbourhood Plans list the facilities that they would like protecting, as it helps to make the Plan more locally distinctive.	The Neighbourhood Plan policies include criteria that are specific to North Crawley, they should not duplicate the wording of policies contained in Plan:MK. This particular statement has not been added to the policy because it is already stated in Plan:MK policy CC3, which will be applied before Policy C1 of the Neighbourhood Plan.  See paragraph 3.5.1
		Policies Map	The plan shows areas in grey which is confusing as these aren’t sites which are designated for any particular use. I have attached the plan I prepared previously for the	Apologies, incorrect version of the plan used in the draft document. This has now been amended.

NORTH CRAWLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – CONSULTATION STATEMENT

			Steering Group. I am happy to update that Plan to include policy numbers.	
		Community Project	Community Project 3 – the text font size is not consistent.	Noted and amended.
Simon Peart	Conservation and Archaeology Department Milton Keynes Council	Policy H3	<p>Thank you for the meeting earlier this month to discuss the North Crawley Neighbourhood Plan, specifically the Chicheley Road Site (site H3, Top Croft).</p> <p>Thank you for providing the notes of the meeting. You will remember that the key thrust of the discussions was that we felt development on the site is possible, subject to a sympathetic design that preserves the setting of the nearby designated heritage assets. At present the site contributes to the rural setting of these assets, it is important that any development is appropriate for this setting and provides an effective transition between this open rural landscape and the village. We discussed how this might be achieved, identifying the number and scale of buildings as key factors. Alongside this we discussed the use of traditional and/or muted materials and simple building forms to allow a ‘softer’ look. We said that we would take another look the design guide and policies and provide further advice on these aspects. We noted that the Parish Council itself recognises the need for this and has pushed back on some of the original specifications / layouts from AECOM.</p> <p>There are aspects of the design guide that give cause for concern from a heritage perspective. We couldn’t read the annotations on the indicative layout and the accompanying text pays no specific reference to the heritage context but listed a number of factors.</p>	<p>Notes of the meeting are available in the Neighbourhood Plan section of the Parish Council website.</p> <p>Amendments have been made to the Design Guide document (Appendix 6) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• page 34 – Site conditions – H3 – specific mention is made of the potential impact of development on this site on the designated heritage assets</li> <li>• pages 36 to 40 – removed all indicative plans, replaced with an aerial view of the plot with annotations. Increased references to the heritage assets and the key features of an acceptable scheme, including building typologies and materials.</li> <li>• pages 62 to 64 – Key Features, amended on page 39 have been transferred to the summary table.</li> </ul> <p>Amendments have been made to the Neighbourhood Plan as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• page 9 – added paragraph 2.4.3</li> </ul>



			<p>Illustrations on page 36 and 40 show a full two storey development, with indicated houses of standard types. The layout plan shows development around the perimeter with dwellings arranged in linear rows, the emphasis appearing to be on an inward facing development, with increased screening around its edge. The largest of houses appear to be located in the most prominent parts of the site – the western and southern corners, both immediately alongside Chicheley Road, the land sloping in both directions across the site to a high point at the latter. Whilst there are good size gardens the scheme remains quite intensive given the surroundings. The likely character of the site resulting from this is likely to be a standard suburban one, with assertive gables in prominent positions.</p> <p>We felt instead that a scheme based predominantly on one and one and a half storey dwellings around an irregular, informal plan that avoids linear rows of buildings, where roofs, rather than walls are the key features within longer distance views could be acceptable. As above, simple forms and a muted, high quality materials palette would assist this. Whilst not seeking to dictate a specific number of dwellings, we felt that taking these considerations into account that it was more likely that 15 dwellings was appropriate on the site, although it might of course be possible to achieve twenty with a particularly good, context specific scheme.</p> <p>As discussed at the meeting, if an indicative layout is to be included in the neighbourhood plan, then it should</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• page 17 – paragraph 3.1.18 - specific mention of the heritage sites and the importance of working closely with the C&amp;A Department.</li> <li>• page 19 – Policy H3:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ number of houses amended from 20 to ‘about 15 dwellings, with the potential to achieve up to 20 if a (Plan:MK, policy HE1(B) compliant) heritage assessment indicates that a sympathetic, context specific scheme can be brought forward without causing additional harm to the designated heritage assets.’</li> <li>○ reference made to proposals providing a context specific scheme</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>be one that we would support if it was subsequently brought forward through the planning process. At this point, we don't think the current one is something that could be supported from a heritage perspective, so for that reason it would not be possible to advocate its inclusion, particularly given that no formal heritage assessment has been undertaken. If it were to be omitted, the design guide could be re-worded to compensate, strengthening the description to indicate the importance of context and the type of development that is appropriate for the site.</p> <p>We had discussed in the team whether the pond could be moved to the edge so that the green space and openness that it affords could provide a dual role - also helping the transition to the wider rural surroundings, although we acknowledge that this would be subject to ecology considerations and that it might cause a reduction in immediate access to it from the public footpath.</p> <p>In respect of policy H3, as already discussed, reference to Moat Farm being a scheduled ancient monument is required.</p>	<p>Indicative layouts for site H3 removed. Design Guide reworded to emphasise the importance of the heritage setting and to indicate the key features of an acceptable scheme for Site H3.</p> <p>Amendments made to pages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 34</li> <li>• 37 to 40</li> <li>• 62 and 63</li> </ul> <p>The pond is a natural feature, sitting in a natural depression in the ground. It is a seasonal pond, containing water for only parts of the year and thus provides a specific habitat – favouring frogs in particular. If it were to be relocated it would become an unnatural feature, it would need to be lined and maintained and it would lose the specific features that make it a valuable wildlife habitat that is worth preserving. Its current location allows easy access for users of the PRow. The Neighbourhood Plan policies will not support altering the position of the pond.</p> <p>Noted – amendment made</p>
			<p>Additional discussions regarding strengthening the importance in the documents of the Moat Farm heritage assets and the Conservation Area in relation to sites H6 and H7, have taken place, following a response</p>	<p>Additional statements have been added to the Design Guide regarding heritage considerations for sites H6 and H7 on pages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 35</li> <li>• 50 to 53</li> </ul>

NORTH CRAWLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – CONSULTATION STATEMENT

			from Historic England to MKC environmental screening assessment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 56 to 59</li> <li>• 62 &amp; 63</li> </ul> <p>Additional statements have been added to the Neighbourhood Plan regarding sites H3, H6 and H7:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 2.4.2 &amp; 2.4.3</li> <li>• Para 3.1.18</li> <li>• Policy H3</li> <li>• Para 3.1.20</li> <li>• Policy H6</li> <li>• Para 3.1.22</li> <li>• Para 3.1.23</li> <li>• Policy H7</li> <li>• Para 3.3.4</li> <li>• Policy HD1</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

**Table 2. Consultation Responses May 2022**

A total of 6 residents attended the drop-in sessions in April and May. A range of views was expressed, these are anonymised and summarised below:

2 residents	Enquired about the availability of bungalows for residents wishing to downsize.	Bungalows of varying sizes will be available on the Top Croft, Orchard Way and Folly Lane sites.
1 resident	Had received a letter regarding the current planning application on the Maslin Site and asked for clarification as to what it meant in relation to the Neighbourhood Plan.	The letter referred to the removal of a turning circle for the outline planning application for two bungalows on this site. Part of the site currently lies outside the settlement boundary and so 2 dwellings is deemed appropriate for the site. If the Neighbourhood Plan is approved at the referendum, the whole of the site – including the portion that currently lies outside the settlement boundary, will be allocated for development and this planning application will be superseded by an application for 5 dwellings (including bungalows). The removal of the turning circle is of little significance under the circumstances.

NORTH CRAWLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – CONSULTATION STATEMENT

2 residents	<p>Asked for clarification of the number of new dwellings allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan and any changes to the plan following the previous consultation.</p> <p>Pleased that the site allocations are close to the village and have not changed the shape of the village significantly.</p> <p>Pleased that affordable housing has been included in the policies.</p> <p>Grateful to the Steering Group for its hard work and perseverance.</p>	<p>There will be 30 to 35 new dwellings. 15 to 20 on Top Croft - the Chicheley Road site (H3), 5 on the Maslin site (H4), 5 on the adjacent, Orchard Way site (H5), 3 on the High Street site (H6) and 2 on the Folly Lane site (H7). Changes following the Dec/Jan consultation are to the wording in the Housing Policies (H3 to H7) that now include reference to a requirement for archaeological investigations to take place and the removal of indicative site designs for Site H3. The wording around protecting the heritage and character of the village has been strengthened to reflect the outcomes of the Strategic Environmental Assessment.</p> <p>There have been no amendments to the site allocations or number of new dwellings proposed. A minor amendment has been made to the previously proposed settlement boundary, it has reverted back to its current position, which ensures that the garden adjacent to number 45 High Street remains outside the settlement boundary and therefore unavailable for development.</p>
1 resident	<p>Felt that the Neighbourhood Plan was not ambitious enough. There had been a lost opportunity to make a real difference to the village by allocating 100 houses in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>Feedback throughout the development of the plan would suggest that this is not the majority view and that many people would like to see no development at all but recognise that some development is desirable to support the future of the village. A 10% increase in the size of the village offers manageable and sustainable growth while retaining the sense of community and protecting the rural characteristics and historic environment.</p>

**Below are written submissions received by the May 16<sup>th</sup> deadline. The full text of each submission has been included with the response from the Steering Group.**

Name	Organisation	Policy No	Key Points	Steering Group Response
Nick Crank	Milton Keynes Council Conservation and Archaeology Department	Housing Policies H3 to H7	All the proposed housing allocations in North Crawley are of some potential archaeological sensitivity, though our subsequent discussions have focused heavily on the Top Croft, Chicheley Road site due to the wider setting issues. In relation to the sites in the Neighbourhood Plan I can offer the following additional archaeological advice to be incorporated into the relevant policies:	All advice incorporated into the relevant policies.

			<p>Top Croft, Chicheley Road (Policy H3):</p> <p>Application to be informed by an Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment. Field evaluation (geophysical survey and/or trial trenching) may be required at the application stage, secured by condition.</p> <p>The Former Maslin Site (Policy H4):</p> <p>Application to be informed by an Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment. Field evaluation (geophysical survey and/or trial trenching) may be required at the application stage, secured by condition.</p> <p>Land north of Orchard Way (Policy H5):</p> <p>Application to be informed by an Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment. Field evaluation (geophysical survey and/or trial trenching) may be required at the application stage, secured by condition.</p> <p>Land to the south of the High Street (Policy H6):</p> <p>Pre-determination/application archaeological field evaluation necessary due to potential for medieval / post-medieval occupation.</p> <p>Land to the west of Folly Lane (Policy H7):</p> <p>Pre-determination/application archaeological field evaluation necessary due to potential for medieval / post-medieval occupation.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

NORTH CRAWLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Isaac Smith	Historic England		<p>Thank you for inviting Historic England to comment on the above neighbourhood plan. On the basis of the information currently available, we do not wish to offer any detailed comments at this stage.</p> <p>We would refer you to our general advice on successfully incorporating historic environment considerations into your neighbourhood plan, which can be found here: <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/">https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/</a>.</p> <p>For further specific advice regarding the historic environment and how to integrate it into your neighbourhood plan, we recommend that you consult your local planning authority conservation officer.</p> <p>We may wish to make specific comments on proposals later in the planning process.</p>	Noted.
John & Karen Miles	Residents		<p>We have been reading the most recent notes circulated by yourselves in connection with the production of a Strategic Environmental Assessment. As we read the document, it struck us what a lot of hard work the SG has put into this apparently never-ending process of completing the Neighbourhood Plan. Towards the end of your notes, you almost apologise for going round in circles and the delays which this has caused.</p> <p>We do not think you should apologise. Rather, we should thank you for the enormous efforts which you have put into this endeavour. In particular, we owe Helen a mighty ‘thank you’ for her unrelenting efforts to steer the ship and keep us all informed whilst it sails along. You are doing a fantastic job on our behalf and we would like you to know how much we appreciate your efforts.</p>	Noted with thanks.

NORTH CRAWLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Jane Hennell	Canal and River Trust		Thank you for consulting the Canal & River Trust on the North Crawley Neighbourhood Plan. As the Canal and River Trust do not own or maintain any waterways within the plan area, the trust has no comments to make on the proposal.	Noted.
--------------	-----------------------	--	--	--------