

## North Crawley Neighbourhood Plan, Reg 16 consultation responses

**Ken Graham**

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. A 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 in 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.



Clerk to the Parish Council  
3 Folly Lane, North Crawley  
Newport Pagnell  
Bucks, MK16 9LN

15<sup>th</sup> November 2018

Dear Councillors

**Revised draft of North Crawley Neighbourhood Plan**

Thank you for the revised draft Neighbourhood Plan which has addressed some of the comments raised in response to the original draft. However, there are still some issues that I feel need to be addressed before the plan can be presented for a village referendum.

**Land west of Folly Lane**

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 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.

**Site 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.

**Site 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.

**Total allocation of houses.**


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.

I look forward to seeing and supporting a further revised Plan.

Yours sincerely

Ken Graham





Clerk to the Parish Council  
3 Folly Lane, North Crawley  
Newport Pagnell  
Bucks, MK16 9LN

13<sup>th</sup> June 2018

Dear Councillors

### **North Crawley Neighbourhood Plan**

First I must congratulate the Committee that have carried out the work on the Plan for all their hard work and a very professional draft document. I have read through the draft and reread the background material on which it is based. I have a number of concerns which I feel should be addressed before the document goes forward.

#### **The Housing Needs Assessment**

The Housing Needs Assessment prepared sets out the background to housing demand and supply in the area. The assessment points out that 196 out of 237 households do not have dependent children. From this fact, the authors appear to have deduced that there would be low demand for housing from the children of families in the village and therefore no need to make particular accommodation for them. This completely ignores: 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.

This theme appears to have followed through into the draft Plan, which mainly identifies larger 3-4 bedroomed homes and homes suitable for the elderly as the key need. North Crawley is already well served with 3+ bedroom homes - what is required going forward is 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. It is also important that housing for young families is located near the heart of the village and preferably away from busy roads. This means the plots of land which you identify as H3 and H4 must include smaller houses for young families. This will then support the school, church, pubs, shop and various social activities for the future. As the Plan is currently drafted, it is likely to result in North Crawley becoming a retirement village without a school and the other local amenities that we are all currently fortunate enough to enjoy.

When the questionnaire was sent out, it did not include a question that included reference to housing for young families, and yet, this was the most commonly occurring unsolicited comment. Therefore, I feel that this should be looked at again.

### **The Allocated Plots**

The consultation process identified 30-35 as the preferred number of new houses to be accommodated. Personally, I think this is inadequate and will lead to challenges and the need to review the Plan again before the end of the planning period, but that is what was voted for, so that is what should be accommodated.

This I made up of:

- H3 up to 5 dwellings
- H4 11-15 Dwellings
- H5 10-15 dwellings

The numbers proposed for H3 and H4 seem reasonable. However, the proposal for H5 is not realistic. First, the proposal includes building on the entrance to the Slipe which will remove the only access to the field. If there is no access the field it cannot be used or maintained. If it cannot be used or maintained it will become overgrown and no longer be a "Green Space". An unused overgrown piece of land is likely to be targeted for further development as it has no other use. Secondly, even using the gateway, the land is similar in size to the land where the existing six one bed roomed cottages of Terrace Row sit with no off-road parking. H5 is supposed to accommodate 10-15 dwellings with off road parking. This is clearly not achievable, with or without using the gateway to the Slipe. The draft Plan policy map also clearly indicates that the land at H5 is half the size of the land at H4, which is indicated to have the same number of dwellings, which seems a peculiar conclusion. It seems more likely that the number of dwellings that could reasonably be built on all three identified plots is somewhere between 25 and 30. As the Plan needs to account for up to 35, a reassessment is required.

### **Land West of Folly Lane**

Of all the identified potential plots for development the Land West of Folly Lane achieved the most "green lights". The only reason given for not including it, is stated as 'safe vehicular access into the site will be difficult due to the change in levels; the site sits significantly higher than the road'. This is obviously incorrect and seems to assume that either one cannot build on sloping sites or that one cannot access sloping sites. The site in question is similar to those adjacent and opposite. There are three potential access strategies to gain access to the site. One is to build driveways off Folly Lane in the same way as the existing houses on the east side. The second is to construct a single access road similar to that already provided for access to the bungalows at top of Folly Lane. The third is to use the existing access at the bottom of the site in question.

Discounting the single reason for apparently not including this site - which is clearly incorrect, it becomes the highest scoring of all the sites. Furthermore, the landowner has previously indicated that he wishes to develop the site. Therefore, this site should be included in the Plan and will provide the shortfall identified above at H5.

### **Land Owner Agreement**

One of the key factors in delivering a viable Neighbourhood Plan is that the land identified must be available for development in accordance with the Plan. There is no reference in the Plan or other documentation to confirm that the land owners have been approached and have

indicated that they are willing to develop the land as suggested in the Plan. If the final Plan is to be voted on, this vital information must first be sought (or confirmed if already sought).

The adoption of a viable neighbourhood Plan is essential and therefore I am very keen to support one, but as currently presented I could not, and my discussions with other villagers lead me to believe that many feel the same.

I look forward to seeing and supporting a revised Plan.

Yours sincerely

Ken Graham

