

North Crawley Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2033

CONSULTATION STATEMENT



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 two six-week periods of pre-submission consultation in June/July 2018 and October/November 2018.

This consultation statement has been published to summarise both consultation periods by recording the comments received on the drafts the Neighbourhood Plan. It has been updated following an interim version published with the second draft of the plan.

The summary tables overleaf outlines the comments received to both consultations and any changes that were made. The decision to undertake a second formal consultation was taken as a result of the fact that some of the sites and Local Green Space designations changed in size and scope.

No substantive changes were made to the plan itself following the second round of consultation. The evidence base (including this consultation statement) have, however, been updated to provide a more thorough audit trail and explanation for the amendments made to the plan between July and October as well as summarise how consultation has informed the plan in general.

Consultation process

In addition to the two periods of pre-submission publicity, consultation was undertaken on the plan via three main methods in the preparation process. Firstly, public engagement meetings were held at both the start of the Neighbourhood Plan process and midway through in March 2018. In the intervening period in July 2017 a questionnaire was circulated, which is appended to this consultation statement. Finally, a ‘walk-about’ survey of the village was undertaken in January 2019 in which character areas and sites were appraised by members of the public and steering group.

The questionnaire results and feedback provided at the consultation event 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.
- Village amenities including sports facilities, pubs, and shop, should all be protected.

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

All known landowners were written to during the start of the Neighbourhood Plan 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). Following the first round of consultation, specific and direct engagement was undertaken with the North Crawley Estate, who are the principal landowner of sites in the village and who expressed some concerns with the first draft of the plan. This also included meeting with a third-party who owns part of one of the allocations in conjunction with the North Crawley Estate. These meetings were important for establishing that the owners intended to bring forward the allocation (H5) together as well as other changes in the scale and nature of the allocations that would assist with the deliverability of the plan.

Screening

In addition to engagement the Neighbourhood Plan steering group carried out with the local community and landowners, Milton Keynes Council also formally consulted the Environment Agency, Natural England, and Historic England on whether the Neighbourhood Plan required a Strategic Environmental Assessment. The formal view of the statutory bodies was that this is not required for the Neighbourhood Plan.

Pre-submission consultation

Table 1 below summarises the comments received during the first round of pre-submission consultation in June/July 2018 and the response of the steering group in either making amendments or justifying the existing policy/evidence. The pre-submission consultation was advertised by writing to those who had previously expressed an interest in being kept up to date on the Neighbourhood Plan, posters distributed locally, and via other online outlets.

Table 2 below summarises the same information for the second round of pre-submission consultation in October/November 2018, which was publicised via the same means.

TABLE 1: CONSULTATION RESPONSES JUNE-JULY 2018				
Name	Organisation	Policy No.	Key points	Steering Group response
	North Crawley Estate	H5	<p>Density is too high for size of site and would be out of keeping with character of village Impact on adjacent Listed Buildings Access is close to a dangerous bend</p> <p>Suggests Dighton’s Field is added and the boundary of Site H4 redrawn to follow the natural field boundary at the north east hedgerow.</p>	<p>Site H5 extended to allow capacity to be achieved. Remaining policy text mitigates identified issues. Dighton's Field site assessment reconsidered with additional negative impacts in terms of coalescence along Folly Lane identified in ‘landscape’ category, which was previously only an aesthetic assessment and did not allow for coalescence to be considered.</p>
	North Crawley Estate	Allocation of Local Green Space (LGS)	<p>LGS South of plot H5 Proposal must provide compelling evidence that the requirements for its designation are met in full in accordance with NPPF. Justification is vague, lacks evidence, and does not refer to any of the NPPF criteria.</p> <p>The Slupe Proposal is inconsistent with planning guidance and intended solely to block later development in that field. Comments are made on why it is not appropriate to designate this site as LGS which including no evidence of ecology value, tranquillity or historic value.</p>	<p>LGS designation for the Slupe removed.</p>
	North Crawley Estate	SA/SEA development	<p>Although not required, preparing an SA can help to show how a Neighbourhood Plan will contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.</p> <p>Total number of dwellings proposed (30) is not a sustainable level of development to support the local school, two public houses, two village halls and a shop. Further analysis should be carried out in relation to the draft Plan so that the longevity of the village is ensured.</p>	<p>Plan period is 15 years with monitoring policy included. 30-35 dwellings is more than sustainable over that timeframe, particularly when compared with previous 15 years of significantly less growth.</p>
	North Crawley Estate	Housing Supply	<p>The draft Plan does not appear to adequately cross reference other and overarching local planning considerations and we therefore have concern that this draft Plan may not fulfil the necessary supply of land for development.</p>	<p>Basic Conditions statement addresses this.</p>
	North Crawley Estate	Transport	<p>The draft Plan omits to mention or include a Sustainable Transport Plan. It is a viable concern that without further development, existing bus services may not be sustainable.</p>	<p>Unclear what is meant by sustainable transport plan. Travel plans etc. are normally reserved for individual planning applications. Neighbourhood Plan cannot directly influence bus service provision.</p>
	North Crawley Estate		<p>The draft Plan makes no consideration of the financial viability of the 3 proposed sites. If one or more of the 3 sites fails to be developed within a reasonable timescale, the community may once again be threatened with development it doesn’t want.</p>	<p>Two allocations extended in order to improve viability.</p>
	North Crawley Estate	Suggested sites to be included	<p>Land South of The Slupe Although development would extend into open countryside, there are potentially three major gains for the village in developing a site south of The Slupe, including the opportunity for valuable traffic calming measures at the end of the High Street.</p>	<p>Some additional areas of the Slupe included.</p>

NORTH CRAWLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – CONSULTATION STATEMENT

	North Crawley Estate	Suggested sites to be included	<p>Dighton’s Field, Folly Lane 0.49 hectares could provide 15 dwellings with 327 m2 per dwelling. The site is available, deliverable and suitable for residential development that could be delivered within the next five years.</p> <p>Appreciate concerns about a development which would join the village to the Folly Lane settlement but believe the site would be better suited, if planned sensitively, to relieve the pressures that would be caused by the proposed H5 development.</p>	The steering group believe there are sequentially preferable sites over the 15 year plan period.
	North Crawley Estate	Suggested sites to be included	<p>Enlarged Site H4 to include to the North of The Recreation Ground Arbitrary north eastern boundary across the middle of a field, no hedge or natural boundary on the ground. To relieve the pressure on site H5, the boundary of H4 should be redrawn to follow the natural field boundary at the north east hedgerow to the North of The Recreation Ground (Look at sheet 2 for site image).</p> <p>A site of this size would allow for affordable housing, opportunity to calm and order traffic by a one way system, frame the recreation ground and shift village centre of gravity to recreation ground.</p>	H4 extended although not to the extent suggested, which would result in significant landscape harm.
	North Crawley Estate	Suggested sites to be included	<p>Yard to rear of Village Hall Ideal site for the development of sheltered housing for the elderly of the village.</p>	Site could come forward under the terms of the infill policy.
	North Crawley Estate	Suggested sites to be included	<p>Garden at 45 High Street, east end of High Street Settlement boundary proposed includes the house but excludes its garden, this anomaly requires rectification.</p> <p>The garden provides sufficient space for two small semi-detached entry level homes for young couples, including a room in each for home-working, therefore lessening the amount of commuting to a workplace and also generating employment within the locality.</p>	Anomaly corrected.
Eleanor Sweet-Escott	Natural England	H3, H4, H5	<p>Requirement to conserve biodiversity and provide biodiversity net gain through planning policy (Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 and section 109 of the NPPF).</p> <p>Please ensure that any development policy in your plan includes wording to ensure “all development results in a biodiversity net gain for the parish”.</p> <p>Policies around Biodiversity Net Gain should propose the use of a biodiversity measure for development proposals.</p>	Covered by NPPF and Local Policy.

Eleanor Sweet-Escott	Natural England	L1 - Local Green Space Designation	<p>Removal of green space in favour of development may have serious impacts on biodiversity and connected habitat.</p> <p>Please consider the creation of Green Infrastructure policies in your plan. Elements of GI such as open green space, wild green space, allotments, and green walls and roofs, some of which you have already, can all be used to create connected habitats suitable for species adaptation to climate change.</p> <p>The recently produced Neighbourhood Plan for Benson, in South Oxfordshire provides an excellent example.</p>	LGS designations are intended to preserve GI.
Ken Graham	N/A	Housing Needs Assessment	<p>The assessment points out that 196 out of 237 households do not have dependent children. Deduction that there would be low demand for family housing ignores:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) households with non-dependent children; b) the fact that children of existing families have been forced out of the village due to the lack of availability of suitable housing and high housing costs; and c) the high number of elderly people residing in the village due to the presence of an unusually high number of housing units (bungalows) designed for elderly residents. <p>A mix of 1, 2-3 and 3-4 bedroomed homes to complement the existing housing stock and provide for progression from the formation of households through, as families grow and providing a balanced population for the village.</p> <p>H3 and H4 must include smaller houses for young families</p>	Policy specifies dwelling size.

Ken Graham	N/A	Allocated sites H3,H4 & H5	<p>Housing numbers proposed for H3 and H4 seem reasonable but H5 is not realistic given its size. H4 and H5 have the same amount of housing proposed but H5 is half the size. Reassessment is required to see if the 3 sites can realistically provide 35 houses. Building on the access onto Slipe will prevent maintenance of the green space.</p> <p>Land West of Folly Lane This site is the most suitable for development but was discounted incorrectly for reasons of access. There are 3 options for access:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Build driveways off Folly Lane 2. Single access road similar to access for bungalows at top of Folly Lane 3. Use existing access at bottom of site <p>Discounting the single reason for apparently not including this site - which is clearly incorrect, it becomes the highest scoring of all the sites.</p>	Site H5 extended. Site assessment for land west of Folly Lane amended.
Ken Graham	N/A	Land Owner Agreement	Land identified must be available for development in accordance with the Plan, no reference confirming that the land owners have been approached and have indicated that they are willing to develop the land as suggested in the Plan.	Landowners have been approached as outlined in site assessment summary.
Hannah Lorna Bevins	National Grid	N/A	<p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high pressure gas pipelines, and also National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate and High Pressure apparatus.</p> <p>National Grid has identified that it has no record of such apparatus within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p>	Noted.
Martin Small	Historic England		Steering Group's vision "that any future development recognises and respects its history, rural landscape and unique village character". Suggest revision to be a vision for the future of North Crawley that the Plan's policies and proposals will help deliver (and which provides justification, or an audit trail, for those policies and proposals).	Noted.
Martin Small	Historic England		Community's comment "North Crawley has a set of unique heritage characteristics, based on its history and estate legacy, which should be reflected in its future development". The reference to the "estate legacy" is intriguing (see comment on Appendix 2 of the Plan below).	Supporting text altered.
Martin Small	Historic England		Welcome explicit recognition in Policy H2 that infill development that would adversely affect the character of the conservation area would be inappropriate and therefore would not be permitted. Suggest that the wording be amended to "special interest, character and appearance of the conservation area and/or the significance of other heritage assets".	Changes made to policy text.

Martin Small	Historic England	H5	<p>Site H5 Land South of High Street is located opposite a Grade II listed building, do not anticipate that the development that would be permitted by Policy H5 would necessarily detract from its significance.</p> <p>Site also lies within the North Crawley Conservation Area. Welcome, in principle, the third criterion to complement the Conservation Area, has any assessment of the contribution of this site to the special interest, character and appearance of the Conservation Area been undertaken ?</p> <p>We note from that there is no Character Appraisal for the Conservation Area by MKC, has this site been assessed by itself? A Character Appraisal for the Conservation Area should be an essential component of the evidence base underpinning the Plan.</p>	Conservation Area appraisal exercise will be considered separately to NP process.
Martin Small	Historic England	Objective for Heritage & Design	Welcome, in principle, the Objective for Heritage & Design, although it should be amended to specifically include the conservation and enhancement of heritage assets.	Changes made to policy text.
Martin Small	Historic England	HD1	Welcome, in principle, Policy HD1 although suggest that it could be considered to not be robust, as it only states that new development “should” “respect the key characteristics”, not “must”.	Changes made to policy text.
Martin Small	Historic England	HD1	Welcome the character area assessments undertaken by the Steering Group and their reference in Policy HD1, and consider that these provide the “understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics” required by the Framework.	Noted.
Martin Small	Historic England	Paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2	<p>Paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2 give a tantalising glimpse of the historical development of North Crawley, and the “potted history” of the parish in Appendix 2 is very interesting.</p> <p>Nowhere in the Plan is there any description of the historic environment of the parish today. What is important is how the history has shaped and formed the historic environment to be found currently in the parish.</p> <p>An example of this connection with the past is the North Crawley estate, which paragraph 4.2 explains “is evident in the layout and style of many of the buildings at the historic core of the village”. The Plan does not explain, either in the main text or Appendix 2, how, why or when the estate was laid out.</p>	Noted. Full conservation area appraisal exercise will be considered separately to NP process.
Martin Small	Historic England		<p>Request recognition of the 17 listed buildings and three scheduled monuments in the parish, including the Grade I Church of St Firmin.</p> <p>The Plan could explain when the Conservation Area was designated, the reason for its designation (its special interest), and the fact there is no Character Appraisal or Management Plan for the Area. The policies map should identify the Conservation Area boundary so as to show the area to which Policy HD2 applies. It would also be possible and helpful to show the listed buildings in the village.</p>	Noted. Full conservation area appraisal exercise will be considered separately to NP process.

Martin Small	Historic England		<p>Is there a list of locally-important buildings and features? If not, this could be a community project to expand the evidence base for the Plan.</p> <p>Non-designated heritage assets can make an important contribution to creating a sense of place and local identity.</p>	Noted. Full conservation area appraisal exercise will be considered separately to NP process.
Martin Small	Historic England		<p>Have the Buckinghamshire Historic Environment Record and Buckinghamshire Historic Landscape Character Assessment been consulted? The former for non-scheduled archaeological sites, some of which may be of national importance?</p>	HER consulted for site assessment exercise.
Martin Small	Historic England	Paragraph 4.3	<p>Concerned about paragraph 4.3 as it has the wrong emphasis. The NPPF states that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource that should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance (paragraph 126).</p>	Changes made to supporting text.
Martin Small	Historic England	Paragraph 4.5 and Policy HD2	<p>Paragraph 4.5 and Policy HD2 should be reworded to refer to conservation rather than preservation.</p> <p>Emphasise that development in the Conservation Area (of any form) will be permitted where the special interest, character and appearance of the conservation area, and the significance of the heritage assets within it, will be conserved or enhanced.</p> <p>The policy could be made more bespoke to the Conservation Area if there are specific characteristics or other contributors to its special interest that should be protected, to “put broader strategic heritage policies from the local plan into action at a neighbourhood scale” (NPPG).</p> <p>A policy for the conservation and enhancement of all heritage assets within the Plan area would be welcome. There could be a specific policy for the conservation and enhancement of the “set of unique heritage characteristics, based on its history and estate legacy” that the community has recognised.</p>	Changes made to supporting text.
Martin Small	Historic England		<p>Unusual that there is no section of the Plan describing the attributes and characteristics of the Plan area.</p> <p>Would also expect to see a section on the sustainability issues within the Plan area, derived from higher level policies (NPPF and emerging Plan:MK) and the community consultation, in order to provide the audit trail (together with the Vision and objectives) for the policies of the Plan.</p> <p>For example, although none of the heritage assets in the parish are currently on the Historic England Heritage at Risk Register the Register does not include grade II listed secular buildings outside London. Has a survey of the condition of grade II buildings in the Plan area been undertaken? If not, then this could be another community project to contribute to the evidence base of the Plan).</p>	Noted. Full conservation area appraisal exercise will be considered separately to NP process.

NORTH CRAWLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Martin Small	Historic England		Has there been any or is there any ongoing loss of character, particularly within the Conservation Area, through inappropriate development, inappropriate alterations to properties under permitted development rights, loss of vegetation, insensitive streetworks etc?	Noted. Full conservation area appraisal exercise will be considered separately to NP process.
Martin Small	Historic England		NPPF states that “Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan”. Although this refers to Local Plans, we consider that the principle is also applicable to Neighbourhood Plans. We feel that Policy T2 might need to be reworded slightly to satisfy this requirement and that Policies C2 and M1 do not comply with it.	Policies T2, C2 and M1 have value in determining the plan's scope and application.
Stewart Patience	Anglian Water	Policy 3 and H4	There is an existing pumping station located on the boundary of these sites. 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. It is therefore proposed that the following wording should be included in the policies H3 and H4 of the Neighbourhood Plan: 'Consider the proximity of the foul pumping station in the design and layout of the scheme, and allow for a distance of 15 metres from the boundary of the curtilage of the dwellings to reduce the risk of nuisance/loss of amenity associated with the operation of the pumping station.'	Policy text changed.
Derek Harpur		H2	Policy H2 highlights the adverse impacts on amenity or privacy where infill is allowed. This falls short on its promise with regard to the new infill in Chichley Road which was opposed on the grounds of invasion of privacy to existing residents. This was not recognised by the planning department and so does not give much confidence that this will have any impact on subsequent infill applications.	Noted. Neighbourhood Plan cannot be applied retrospectively.
Derek Harpur		H3, H4 & H5	Sites H3 and H4 are most suitable as they blend in with the existing modern estate and do not appear to present any problems with access. H5 is not suitable for the following reasons: Traffic calming in the form of humps et al would not enhance this area and would cause their own problems with added pollution from vehicles slowing down and speeding up again. Development here would encourage people to park outside the new houses and cause considerable danger to traffic using the High Street.	Noted. Site H5 considered sequentially preferable in site assessment.
Derek Harpur		Paragraph 5.4	Paragraph 5.4 mentions that rights of way are cherished and people appreciate the rural surroundings. Great care needs to be taken that footpaths and bridleways are not 'surfaced' in a way which would urbanise the country feel of the area. You cannot keep the 'intrinsic beauty of the countryside' if you tarmac rural paths and bridleways.	Noted.

Derek Harpur			<p>Observations on the document. (These are not criticisms). The map showing the areas with coloured lines around them omits to mention that the manorial properties are outlined in green. All the other colours are mentioned. It states that there are no rights of way through the manorial properties. There is a footpath on the OS Pathfinder 1024 (1989) from Broadmead to Crawley Grange. In the village heart appraisal under open spaces, Pound Lane has been spelt without capitals. In the Folly Lane appraisal under Roads, streets and paths, it is referred to as Folly Road.</p> <p>These do not detract from the document and are only mentioned for the accuracy of the final draught.</p>	Noted.
Chris & Tessa Toye		H3 & H4	<p>Areas selected for development on Orchard Way (H3 & H4) do not provide one of the key fundamentals discussed at the initial stage. It should still be a priority for this beautiful village - to maintain a true centre for the village which is the church/institute/hall/pubs/shop - the high street.</p> <p>In selecting these two sites the village becomes further unbalanced and I can not understand how an independent reviewer, given the remit of the village has selected two sites on the same street.</p> <p>What is the difference between the larger of the two proposed developments on Orchard Way and the recently rejected 'Moat Farm' development where the villagers were asked to oppose the plan? - Fundamentally it's a green/rural space looking to be changed to residential.</p>	Noted. H3 and H4 identified as sequentially preferable in site assessment process.
Chris & Tessa Toye			<p>Maslin site Number of dwellings on this site is inappropriate. Would access from Chicheley Road behind the bungalows be used? Size of site will not provide enough parking for size of dwellings</p>	Exact specification of site will be determined through planning applications
Chris & Tessa Toye			<p>Settlement boundary line does not incorporate all dwellings of current residents in Brooke End and further down on Folly Lane, Pound Lane. Why not? Are those residents able to comment on where proposed developments should or should not be?</p>	Settlement boundary largely follows existing Local Plan settlement boundary.
Esther Potts		H3 & H4	<p>Little Crawley Green is used daily for recreational purposes and should be included in the Green Space Designation section.</p> <p>There has already been substantial development on the Kilpin Green side of the High Street and Sites H3 and H4 are moving further away from the "village heart" and creating an unbalanced layout of the village.</p> <p>The development of H3 and H4 would cause a significant impact on the current landscape particularly to the residents of Orchard Way also causing them a loss of privacy.</p>	Site H3 and H4 are considered sequentially preferable in site assessment process.

NORTH CRAWLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Babs, Stuart & Keith Lovell		Objective 6	<p>We are pleased to see your main objective (6) to retain and improve all existing facilities in the village but are disappointed that our existing tennis club is not mentioned. Whilst the stated community facilities are not unexpected in a village they are rather thin.</p> <p>The facilities include the sports site at Ringcroft Farm which has served the local community for the past 4 years as a tennis and sports club. Disappointed that the club at Ringcroft Farm is not included but notice that the childrens nursery at Brook End also does not get a mention.</p>	Policy C1 covers all community facilities even if not specifically mentioned.
Phil Potts			Like to see a much stronger statement and policy about minimising on-street parking throughout the village by providing alternative car parking.	No alternative car parking sites have been made available.
Phil Potts		L1	Little Crawley Green should be added to the list (The owner is rumoured to have offered to sell part of this space for the development of a private garden in certain circumstances).	Little Crawley Green serves a very limited population and may not qualify for LGS designation.
Phil Potts			Why has The Slipe has been included in the list of local green spaces? It was identified as an area for possible housing development previously.	LGS at the Slipe has been removed.
Phil Potts			Why is Little Crawley not included in the character assessment in Appendix 2?	Little Crawley is outside the settlement boundary of the village and therefore is not expected to accommodate development that will need to be in keeping
Phil Potts			<p>Other than in a historic context, Little Crawley gets no mention in the plan. In relatively recent history, a planning application was made to develop housing in fields immediately to the north of the hamlet.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan should make a strong statement about a commitment to maintain and protect the existing hamlet.</p>	Little Crawley is 'protected' by being outside the settlement boundary.
Phil Potts			<p>No mention of industrial / commercial developments.</p> <p>Are they to be permitted/encouraged and if established, how are they to be managed?</p> <p>What appeared to be a small commercial development in Little Crawley is in danger of developing into an eyesore.</p> <p>These issues should be covered in the neighbourhood plan, especially planning applications that require change of use of agricultural land or residential property.</p>	Policy resisting employment uses on transport grounds added.
Phil Potts			No commitment to joining the village to the Milton Keynes redway cycle/footpath network.	Unlikely to be viable.
Barbara Potts		H4	The development H4 , along Orchard Way, adds to an already large development North of the village centre resulting in an unbalanced village development.	Site H3 and H4 are considered sequentially preferable in site assessment process.

NORTH CRAWLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Barbara Potts		L1	There is a small area of grassland (Little Crawley Green) in Little Crawley near the junction with Chicheley Road between Gog Lane and the farm field boundary. This area is planted with trees and the grass is regularly mown. Suggest that this area should be designated as a village 'green space'	Little Crawley Green serves a very limited population and may not qualify for LGS designation.
Karol Harris		Suggested sites to be included	Consideration of land down Folly Lane to be considered within the settlement boundary and allocated for development for 2 dwellings. The piece of land was part of the family farm and up to the late 1990's had various farm buildings on it.	Neighbourhood Plan considers sites in proximity to existing settlement boundary only
Nick Freeman			There are a few very minor grammatical errors in the report. Other than that I wish to offer the steering committee my personal thanks for all their hard work and I trust that the plan will be acceptable to the residents of North Crawley and to Milton Keynes Council.	Noted.
Graham Cookham		H5	The document refers to a Right of Way running along the southern boundary of the site. Does this refer to the existing footpaths in the Slipe if so they run along the Western and Northern boundaries (see attached extract from the Parish Paths leaflet) or the gated access to the field? Consideration should be given to access for maintenance of the designated Local Green Space to the west of the existing tree.	Policy refers to all rights of way, clarification added.

TABLE 2: CONSULTATION RESPONSES OCTOBER-NOVEMBER 2018

Name	Organisation	Policy No.	Key points	Steering Group response
Nick Freeman		Appendix	One very minor typo in Schedule 1 "Potted History". In para 6 I think it should read Thomas Boswell of Auchinleck.	Noted and amended.
[redacted]			Concerns regarding comments from third party in earlier consultation [full text redacted].	Comments do not concern a site or policy considered by Neighbourhood Plan. No change necessary.
Ken Graham			Following the initial assessment and survey of residents the steering group hosted a meeting at "The Institute" to explain the process and options. As previously commented the Land west of Folly Lane scored the highest in the assessment process and therefore should be the first option for development. In the interim consultation statement the steering group has stated in response to my comment and North Crawley Estates comment that; "Dighton's Field site assessment revised with added negative impacts in terms of coalescence along Folly Lane" and "Site assessment for land west of Folly Lane amended" This indicates that rather than follow the published assessment process and scoring system, that for reasons not explained, the steering group have changed the evidence to fit a pre-determined outcome. All of the material used in developing the plan is obviously a matter of public record. If the plan continues based on a changed assessment that was not part of the public presentation, it is clearly at risk of legal challenge which in turn could result in the plan being discredited and a free for all, in new	All sites were reconsidered following the first round of consultation. Site selection process was purposefully subjective to take account of value judgements, which change according to consultation feedback. Coalescence was considered to not have been adequately covered by first round of site assessments and so was incorporated into landscape assessment on review, which resulted in the change in the 'score' for land west of Folly Lane. Steering group consider that the sites selected are sequentially preferable and remain concerned about both an increase in vehicle movements on Folly Lane and encouraging coalescence or ribbon development in this area, the south of which lies well outside the existing settlement boundary defined on the Local Plan.


			development. This site is the most suitable for development and has no other obvious uses. Therefore, it should be included in the plan in accordance with original assessment.	
Ken Graham		H3	The revised plan indicates that this site is allocated for residential development for up to five properties. The steering group will no doubt be aware that planning permission has been granted for two properties on this site therefore leaving a shortfall in allocation.	The steering group have engaged directly with the landowners of site H3 and understand that they support the plan and reserve the right to apply for a denser scheme in due course.
Ken Graham		H5	In response to comments, the steering group has extended the land allocated for development at H5. This now includes the Horse Chestnut tree and is still allocated for 15 dwellings. At least half the additional space is taken up by the tree and access past the tree within the Slipe would be difficult if not impossible. Therefore, the allocation of the additional land is unlikely to realise enough space for the allocated number of houses. The land identified as H5 is owned by two separate parties and it cannot be assumed that any development plans will be common. It is more likely that development will be independent. Therefore, the plan must reflect this. As previously pointed out, this plan leaves the remainder of the Slipe landlocked without access for maintenance or agricultural use. This is clearly unsustainable.	The allocation was purposefully phrased as 'up to' 15 dwellings to allow a smaller development to come forward. Based on the site's area equates to a density of up to 40 dwellings per hectare, which is considered efficient particularly as the allocation specifically encourages smaller dwellings on the site. Steering group have engaged with both landowners and understand they are happy to work together to bring the site forward in its amended form. The Slipe can be accessed from the south or through the proposed development.
Ken Graham			The total allocation of houses voted for in the consultation phase was 30-35. The plan as currently configured does not allow for the development of this number of houses and therefore does not represent what the residents voted for. If the land West of Folly Lane was included there would be a reasonable allocation that would meet the original outcome of the assessment and consultation process.	The plan presently allows for up to 35 dwellings to come forward and the steering group consider that the purpose and soundness of the plan would not be undermined if fewer came forward. Nevertheless, if this were the case the plan allows for a review to address this at which point further sites could be reconsidered.

Appendix 1

Please complete and return by
28th July 2017

NORTH CRAWLEY PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2017

QUESTIONNAIRE



THE FUTURE
OF NORTH
CRAWLEY
PARISH

Have your say...

Dear Resident,

A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for the North Crawley parish. The project is being run by a group of local volunteers and the resulting plan will have to be approved in a parish referendum before it can be adopted. The following pages provide you with the opportunity to contribute directly to the plan by giving your views about the future of North Crawley and Little Crawley on a range of topics that affect us all. The views from residents will be analysed and incorporated into the plan.

What is a Neighbourhood Plan?

The Localism Act 2011 introduced the concept of a Neighbourhood Plan. It aims to allow local people to influence, *for the next 15 years*, the planning and development of the area in which they live. It should:

- Develop a shared vision for the parish
- Choose where homes, shops, offices and other developments should be built
- Influence how many houses should be built, and of what type
- Identify and protect important green spaces and other treasured assets

Will the Plan really have any effect?

If properly prepared to comply with the requirements of national and local authority plans, a Neighbourhood Plan has legal force. Planning authorities are obliged to take account of the plan when considering future planning applications once it has been adopted.

How can I contribute to the Neighbourhood Plan?

Please take time to complete this survey as fully and thoughtfully as you can. This is a very rare opportunity for you to genuinely shape the future of the community you have chosen to be a part of. Please don't let the opportunity pass you by. ***Make sure you return this questionnaire by 28th July 2017.*** Details of how to do this are on the last page.

You are free to attend any of the monthly meetings of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. Details of each meeting are published in the Scan, on the Parish Council website and at www.facebook.com/northcrawleynp. Several public events have already been held that were very well attended. Further such events will be organised at key stages in the project to keep you informed, so please try to attend these.

The completed plan will have to be approved by means of a referendum and it is important that there is a high turnout. Please make every effort to vote when the time comes.

“Our vision is to create a Neighbourhood Plan for the good of the community that ensures that any future development recognises and respects its history, rural landscape and unique village character.”

QUESTIONNAIRE

Who can complete this survey?

All residents of the North Crawley Parish who are 16 or over are invited to complete the survey. Additionally, owners of land within the parish, but who live elsewhere, will also be asked to complete it.

How do I complete this survey?

The questionnaire is divided into separate sections relating to the subject that needs to be considered. Within each section you find various statements that you will either agree with, disagree with, or have no strong views about. All you need to do is tick the box that best reflects your opinion. You will also see that there is space to make additional comments if you wish. If you need more space for your comments, please use the blank page towards the end of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire is designed so that the responses to all questions from every resident can be recorded and analysed. Please answer each question in its entirety, even when you have no particular view either way. If you need any help in completing this form, please ask the volunteer who delivered it to you.

Example question

This is an example of how to answer a question. *It is not part of the survey.*

North Crawley High Street should have:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No strong opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
1. Double yellow lines	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Parking meters	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. A cycle path	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

This respondent does not favour yellow lines because they would be unattractive but would not be concerned to see parking meters. She may think a cycle path would encourage cycling and thereby reduce traffic.

SECTION 1 – CHARACTER OF NORTH CRAWLEY PARISH

In this section we would like to know what residents find important about life in the parish and the connection they feel with the villages and surrounding countryside.

1. Are the following characteristics of North Crawley Parish important to you?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No strong opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
1. Access to public green spaces and footpaths	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Quiet, small country lanes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Dark skies, limited amount of street lighting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Open countryside, field patterns, hedgerows	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. The conservation area in the High Street	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Tranquillity and quiet	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Mix of young and old in the community	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Low levels of crime and anti-social behaviour	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9. Write any other comments here:

2. Do you think the following are positive aspects of life in the parish?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No strong opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
1. A sense of belonging to a community	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Ample car parking	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Activities and groups within the parish	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Sports clubs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Local employment opportunities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Footpaths to access open countryside	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Public transport links to nearby towns	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

8. Write any other comments here:

3. Do you think the following are negative aspects of life in the parish?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No strong opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
1. Danger to pedestrians	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Danger to cyclists	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. High traffic levels	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. On-street car parking	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Slow broadband	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Poor mobile phone coverage	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Lack of mains gas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Write any other comments here:					

SECTION 2 - HOUSING

In this section we would like to know what residents think about future housing provision in North Crawley and Little Crawley.

4. With regard to housing in the parish, do you think:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No strong opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
1. There is a need for more houses in the parish	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. There should be more 1 or 2 bedrooms houses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. There should be more 3 or 4 bedrooms houses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. There should be more 5 or 6 bedrooms houses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. There should be more Flats	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. The current mix of housing is about right	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Write any other comments here:					

5. Do you think the parish needs more homes of the following type?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No strong opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
1. Affordable housing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Privately rented accommodation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Shared ownership houses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Privately owned houses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Privately owned bungalows	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Retirement properties	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Write any other comments here:					

SECTION 3 – BUILDING DEVELOPMENT AND LAND USES CHANGES

For the Neighbourhood Plan to be accepted, it must include provision for some additional housing. We cannot prevent development but we can influence its scale, style and location. In this section we want to know what you think about these aspects of future development.

6. There are about 360 homes in the parish. I think that the total number of new homes built during the next 15 years should be:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No strong opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
1. Limited to no more than 35 in total	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Limited to between 36 and 50 in total	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Limited to between 51 and 100 in total	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Unlimited – each application should be considered on its merits	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Write any other comments here:					

7. Any new housing development should be:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No strong opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
1. A single estate that could incorporate new green spaces	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Several smaller estates built separately over the years	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Clusters of 5 or 6 houses spread around the parish	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Infill with just 1 or 2 houses on various sites around the parish	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Write any other comments here:					

8. The style of new housing should:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No strong opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
1. Be designed to complement nearby properties	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Be modern eco-friendly buildings	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Be a mixture of styles	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Include adequate off-street parking	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Write any other comments here:					

9. Bearing in mind the suitability of access roads, any new developments should be sited:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No strong opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
1. Between Kilpin Green and Little Crawley	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. At the Cranfield end of the High Street	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. At the Newport Pagnell end of the High Street	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. On the Newport Pagnell side of Chicheley Road (Moat Farm site)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. To the south of the High Street – behind St Firmin’s	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. To the south of the High Street – behind the allotments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Somewhere else - use the comments box below to suggest other locations					
8. Write any other comments here:					

10. New developments do not have to contain just housing. Employment opportunities within the parish could be created by the building of commercial property. Therefore, the plan should allow for the building of the following:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No strong opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
1. Light Industrial Units	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Offices	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Shops	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Other – please use the comments box below for suggestions					
5. I would like to work in the parish as well as live here	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Write any other comments here:					

SECTION 4 – ROADS AND TRANSPORT

11. The parish would benefit from:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No strong opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
1. Speed bumps	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Other traffic calming measures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Permanent speed cameras	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. A pedestrian crossing in the High Street	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Cycle routes to nearby towns and villages	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Lower speed limits	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Restricting on-street parking	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. More off-street parking	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Being more wheelchair friendly	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Write any other comments here:					

SECTION 5 – PARISH FACILITIES AND AMENITIES

In this section we want to establish the relative importance of various amenities in fostering a community spirit within the parish.

12. The following existing amenities are important to me:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No strong opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
1. St Firmin's Church	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Village shop	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Farm shops	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Public houses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Village Hall	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Village school	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. The Institute (and clubs that meet there)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. The sports field (and clubs that use it)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Riding school	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Allotments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. Children's play area	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. Parks & open spaces	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

13. Write any other comments here

13. I would like to see the following new amenities in the parish:

1.
2.
3.

14. Is there anything else that you feel is important to include in the Neighbourhood Plan?

3.
1.
2.
4.

NORTH CRAWLEY PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2017 QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION 6 – PERSONAL DETAILS

It would be very helpful if you could provide the following information as we may want to clarify your answers. Please be assured that any personal or contact information will be stored securely and will only be used in connection with preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan.

You will need to complete and return this survey by 28th July 2017 to be sure that your views are taken into account. Drop boxes have been placed in the village shop, the Cock Inn and the Chequers for you to return your completed questionnaire. If you need yours to be collected, please ask the volunteer who delivered it.

To encourage residents to respond promptly, all questionnaires returned by 28th July 2017 will be entered into a draw to win a prize of a £25 voucher for the village shop.

16. Your name(s)
17. House number/name and street
18. Telephone number
19. Email address
20. How many people have participated in completing this questionnaire? Everyone aged 16 or over is entitled to participate in this survey and may have a copy of this questionnaire but, if you prefer to complete a questionnaire jointly, we need to know how many votes to count.

21. How many people within each age group live at your address?

Information such as the number of school age children and adults in various age groups will help us understand the existing and future demands for certain amenities.

Under 5	5 - 16	17 – 35	36 - 50	51 - 65	Over 65

You can get further information or help by calling Mike Wilson on 01234 391647 or Fred Flower on 01234 391480. Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.