

North Crawley Neighbourhood Plan, Reg 16 consultation responses

Chris Stavrinides

Reference to North Crawley Neighbourhood Plan, I would like to bring to your attention the following.

I believe the assessment (please refer to the Site Assessment Summary document) of the key criteria between sites NC2 and NC4 (H4) are biased against the NC4 site.

Criteria 1- Walkability and relationship with existing village –

NC2 = The site would be distant from the village core and would potentially diminish the identity of Little Crawley as a separate hamlet. “Red”

NC4 = The site would have a positive relationship with Kilpin Green, particularly if restricted to the area closest to Orchard Way. It is on the edge of the village and therefore not particularly close to the village centre although no less so than existing properties on Orchard Way. “Amber”

This is not valid. The NC2 site is adjacent to the village and not distant in any way, in effect is next to NC3(H3) (refer to SAS doc. fig 2) and less than 200 metres from NC4 hence no issue to walkability. There are properties in North Crawley further away from the centre than NC2. Building around 10 dwellings in the area closest and to the village and next to NC3 will not impact Little Crawley in any way and will not diminish its identity the same manner NC4 site will impact the Orchard Way landscape and residents. The NC2 site is closer to North Crawley than Little Crawley and will not affect or change the current relationship.

Criteria 3- Landscape –

NC2 = The site’s topography means development would be relatively discretely positioned, although views to and from Little Crawley may be harmed and development could lead to coalescence. “Red”

NC4 (H4)= The topography of the site slopes down towards Orchard Way. However, there is a notable change towards more open countryside towards the north-east, which suggests the site should be restricted to the area closest to Orchard Way. There are a small number of dwellings here that overlook the site. This has been considered and it is understood no significant harm to amenity or privacy will result. “Amber”

The views to and from Little Crawley will not be impacted in any way compared to the NC4 impact to Orchard way residents. In effect, the NC2 development will not be facing or impact adversely on any of the residents of Little Crawley.

The NC2 development will be hardly seen, if at all from Little Crawley, but the NC4 development will be directly facing the Orchard Way residents, but this is not highlighted as a major issue in the NC4 criteria.

But the landscape facing Orchard Way will be adversely impacted and the development will be facing directly the Orchard Way residents. The views from Orchard Way have not been considered in the same way.

I do not believe proper consideration was given to the Orchard Way residents.

Criteria 9 – Ownership/availability –

NC2 = The site is understood to be available for development although not actively promoted. “Amber”

NC4 = The site is available for development. “Green”

The NC2 statement “*not actively promoted*” should not be taken into consideration. This could mean that somebody is actively promoting the NC4 site and therefore could be interpreted that the assessment has been influenced.

Being available or not available should be the only consideration and therefore both sites receive the same rating.

Conclusion

NC2 = The site will potentially harm the separation between North Crawley and Little Crawley. Development, particularly towards the northern end, would also be located too far from the village centre. The site should not be allocated for development.

NC4 = The site is well-related to the existing village and would have no harmful impacts if developed along the section closest to Orchard Way. It should be part-allocated for development.

There will be harmful impacts to the NC4 landscape and Orchard Way residents. The NC4 conclusion comment should apply to NC2 as well. Part-allocating the section closest to the village will ensure no harmful impacts. Will not be visible from Little Crawley, will not interfere with the landscape, will be attached to the village, not far in any way from the village centre, be walkable and will not harm the separation between North Crawley and Little Crawley.

To summarise,

The NC4 proposed development will have an unacceptably adverse impact on the amenities of the properties immediately opposite.

The NC4 development will be directly opposite Orchard Way which currently has views of the countryside, over open fields (see photo below); I have purchased my property based on its location.

NC2 development adverse impact will be minimal if at all. Will not interfere, affect existing residents, impact the identity of Little Crawley, impact the views or impact the landscape in any way.

In addition, I believe some of the reasons to decline APP/Y0435/W/17/3186814 - LPA Statement can be applied to the NC4 development as well.

My objection is not against building additional housing, indeed the opposite, but we should avoid detrimental impact upon existing residents when there are other obvious solutions.

I strongly believe that the NC4 (H4) site should be excluded and if a third site is required then NC2 to be included instead in the final proposal.

I understand that you are due to consider the draft NORTH CRAWLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN for inclusion in the Milton Keynes Plan.

I have previously commented to the earlier drafts and some comments have been incorporated in the current draft. However I still feel the current plan does not meet the medium term needs for the village and does not reflect the wishes of the community expressed in the survey carried out last year.

I have attached my original letters in response to the previous drafts which explain my concerns. These basically come down to two linked issues:

1. The draft does not provide for the number of new residences that survey identified for the planning period (30-35). This arises because of current planning consents, the restriction from the tree at H5 and the failure to include the land to the west of Folly Lane.
2. The draft revised draft ignores the scoring system presented to the community as the basis for the plan. When the survey was carried out a scoring system was arrived and presented to the community. This appeared very logical and there were no concerns expressed. The land to the west of Folly Lane scored highest but was discounted because the committee felt there were access issues. I number of respondents including myself and the landowner challenged this and identified possible means of access. In the revised draft the committee still did not include this land but this time stated that this was due to “negative impacts in terms of coalescence along Folly Lane” This was never raised earlier in the process and appears to be a case of making the plan fit a predetermined outcome rather than an objective process. It also implies that Folly Lane is not part of the village, which it is, and always has been. In fact development of this land would provide an opportunity to improve safety for residents in Folly Lane when walking up to the High Street and to the school. It would also assist it meeting the total number of residential units identified in the survey of residents.

The final plan will need to be agreed through a referendum of residents and therefore it needs to meet the majority of wishes expressed in the survey, and needs to be seen to be wholly objective. At the moment this is not the case and there is a very real possibility that it will not be supported.

Thank you for your consideration. I look forward to the final plan.

